

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVI. No. 24 }  
WHOLE No. 415 }

MARCH 24, 1917

{ \$3.00 A YEAR  
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

### Chronicle

**Home News.**—The most remarkable labor document ever issued in this country was published March 12. It is signed by the officers of national and international

***Demands of  
Organized Labor***

trade unions of America, and defines "American labor's position in peace or in war." Labor, it proclaims, has now reached an understanding of its rights, its powers and its value to society. The time therefore has come for it to make definite constructive proposals. While the desire for peace is strongly voiced, the possibility of being drawn into the war, "despite all our endeavors and hopes," is taken into consideration. Wage-earners in war time, the country is told, must "keep one eye on the exploiters at home and the other upon the enemy threatening the national Government."

Previous wars, for whatever purpose waged, developed new opportunities for exploiting the wage-earners. Labor was stripped of its means of defense against enemies at home and was robbed of the advantages, the protections, the guarantees of justice that had been achieved after ages of struggle. For these reasons workers have felt that no matter what the result of war, as wage-earners they generally lost.

Since the waging of war depends upon the cooperation of the masses, the document concludes, the latter should have a voice in determining the conditions upon which they give service, and that voice must find expression in the organized labor movement. Therefore the leaders of this movement demand that service in war should be accompanied by increasing guarantees and safeguards for labor, and the limitations of the profits of employers to fixed percentages. "We declare that determination of profits should be based on costs of processes actually needed for product." A clear differentiation is to be made between military service and police duty, and "industrial service shall be deemed equally meritorious as military service." Where industry is to be placed upon a war basis the plans must be agreed upon between representatives of the Government and representatives of labor.

Finally, in order to safeguard all the interests of the wage earners, organized labor should have representatives on all agencies determining and administering policies for national defense. It is particularly important that organized labor

should have representatives on all boards authorized to control publicity during war time.

With the acceptance of these principles by the Government, "as the indispensable basis for national policies," organized labor declares itself prepared to defend, safeguard and preserve the Republic against all its enemies, whoever they may be.

On the same day that this proclamation was made public came the announcement of a threatened national tie-up of traffic by the "Big Four" railroad brotherhoods. Their demand was for an immediate adoption of the Adamson eight-hour law, and the acceptance of their own interpretation of this legislation. No new strike vote was needed, since the ballot of last summer still pledged the men to obey the strike orders which might at any time be issued by the delegated chiefs of their brotherhoods. A conference between the two conflicting parties was without result, as likewise was the President's appeal, although the railway managers were willing to leave the decision of the entire controversy to the President's Eight-Hour Commission. On Sunday, March 18, it was finally announced that a grace of forty-eight hours had been granted by the brotherhood chiefs, owing to the acceptance of their interpretation of the Adamson act by the railway representatives. The decision of the Supreme Court regarding the validity of this act was in the meantime awaited, but on May 19 the railways freely yielded an eight-hour day so that the concession won by the brotherhoods will aggregate, it is claimed, \$1,000,000 a week. With this surrender of the roads to national necessity the crisis ended.

**The War.**—During the past week the British have further increased their gains north and south of Bapaume. After advancing on the Ancre and taking Gré-  
villiers and the Laupart wood, they  
were soon in possession of the ridge  
dominating the northern part of the  
Bapaume salient. Their steady advance north and south  
of Bapaume and on the Ancre, combined with the French  
gains, forced a retirement of the German lines. Bapaume, the center of the German defenses on the Ancre.

*Bulletin, Mar. 12,  
p.m.-Mar. 19, a.m.*

river front fell into their hands, while the French captured Roye, Lassigny, Noyon and Nesle. South of the river the British by March 18 had gone forward over a front of about sixteen miles from La Maisonette, just west of Péronne to Fresnes, northeast of Chaulnes. Péronne invested from three sides soon fell. In the capture of Eterpigny, the British reached the Somme Canal and the railroad paralleling it, both of which were important transportation lines to Péronne. Before the French advance the Germans were obliged to abandon their strongly fortified positions from Audechy north of the Avre river, to the region south of Lassigny. The French crossed the Roye-Noyon high road at several points, five and one-half miles east of the old lines. From Fresnes, the southern extremity of the British advance, to Roye is ten miles. The French advance in the region of Lassigny was the first important gain made into the German positions between Chaulnes and Soissons in two years.

There were signs on March 19, that the Germans were making their retreat in northern France. The movement has been so considerable that on a front totaling ninety miles they have given way to a depth at many places of 10 to 12 miles. The more important towns occupied by the Allies after Bapaume are Péronne on the Somme and Chaulnes, taken by the British, and Nesle on the upper Somme which troops of both entered, that being now their junction point. The area of the German retirement stretches from Arras to Soissons, from the Scarpe to the Aisne. They are probably retreating to the Arras-Cambrai-St. Quentin-Laon line.

In Macedonia near Doiran the British have pushed forward their line more than half a mile on a front of two miles. In the vicinity of Monastir and in Galicia renewed activity is reported on the part of the French and Germans respectively, but in both these places the situation remains practically unchanged.

In Mesopotamia the British have forced the Turks to retire to a point more than thirty miles north of Bagdad. In Persia, the Russians are approaching Banu, which is about fifteen miles from the Mesopotamian border; further south they have taken Kermanshah and are rapidly driving the Turks through the mountains towards Mesopotamia.

China has severed diplomatic relations with Germany, has dismissed the German Minister at Peking and recalled all Chinese diplomatic and consular officers from German possessions. German ships in the harbor of Shanghai have been seized and their crews interned.

The Government of the United States has taken the first step towards carrying out the President's decision to arm American merchantmen. All nations, except Germany, received the following formal notification of the intention of Washington to protect its citizens while in pursuit of their legitimate and peaceful objects on the seas:

**Armed  
Merchantmen**

In view of the announcement of the Imperial German Government on January 31, 1917, that all ships, those of neutrals included, met with in certain zones on the high seas, would be sunk without any precaution having been taken for the safety of the persons on board, and without the exercise of visit and search, the Government of the United States has determined to place on all American merchant vessels sailing through the barred areas an armed guard for the protection of the vessels and the lives of the persons on board.

Secretary Lansing has made it clear that by the expression, "an armed guard," is meant guns, gunners, and officers of the United States navy. It has been stated officially that merchantmen may install guns fore, aft and amidships and take on Government crews, and fire on submarines on sight. It has not yet been decided whether or not American shipowners may accept the protection offered by the British and French navies.

The "overt act," awaited by Mr. Wilson, is generally believed to have taken place on March 11, when the Algonquin, an American steamer, was shelled without warning, west of Bishop's Rock, and sunk by a German submarine after the crews had taken to the boats. The commander of the submarine refused assistance to the Americans, but they eventually arrived at Scilly without loss of life. Since then other overt acts have been committed, such as the destruction of the City of Memphis, the Illinois and the Vigilancia.

According to the first complete tabulation of official and authenticated semi-official reports of the various belligerents received at Washington, more than ten million men are recorded as killed, wounded, captured or missing in the European war. Among the military men proper 4,441,200 are reported dead, 2,598,500 wounded and 2,564,500 captured and missing. Among civilians, especially on the Russian and Balkan fronts and in Armenia another 400,000 figure as either dead or wounded. The Entente's losses are given as 6,318,400 as against 3,384,800 for the Central Empires. One reason for the great discrepancy between the two is supposed to be the Entente's relative unpreparedness, the disastrous retreats in France at the beginning of the war, and in Russia, from the Mazurian lakes and the Carpathians, and in Rumania. The Entente's dead total 2,890,400 as against 1,550,800 for the Central Empires. The Entente's wounded total 1,676,500 against 922,000 for their enemies, and their captured and missing, 1,652,500 against 912,000 for the Central Empires. These losses are based upon the assumption that in Germany ninety per cent of the total wounded returned to the front and eighty per cent in all the other countries. Russia is the heaviest loser with a total of 3,084,200 men. France has suffered the second highest casualties with a total of 1,810,800, largely because of the early retreat to the Marne and the losses at the defense of Verdun. Her dead total 870,000, her wounded 540,800, and her missing and captured 400,000, although the last figure is believed to be improbably high. England's

**Number of War  
Victims**



total falls far below, being about one-third France's and one-sixth Russia's, owing to her late dispatch of a Continental army. Her total comes to 515,400, 205,400 dead, 102,500 wounded and 107,500 captured and missing. Germany's total casualties are 1,585,200, or 225,000 less than France's. Her dead come to 893,200, her wounded number 450,000, and her captured and missing 245,000. Austria is only a slightly less heavy loser than Germany, with a total of 1,469,100. Her dead, however, number only 523,000, and her wounded 355,000.

**France.**—Late at night on March 17 the French Cabinet headed by Premier Briand was forced to resign. In the hope of filling the vacancy caused by the withdrawal of General Lyautey, who as a result of an attack in Parliament on the aviation service had handed in

*The Briand Cabinet  
Resigns*

his resignation early in the week, the Cabinet met on the morning of the seventeenth under the presidency of M. Poincaré. No decision was reached at that time. It was announced, however, that another meeting would be held later in the day and it was after this meeting that the Cabinet resigned. An official note issued after the meeting says:

The Council of Ministers met tonight (Saturday, March 17) at Elysée palace. The Premier reported on various consultations he had had with a view to completing the Cabinet so it would present itself to the Chamber. After hearing him, the Cabinet decided that circumstances compelled it to leave to the President of the Republic complete liberty to interpret the situation in the best interests of national defense. Consequently, the President of the Council put into the hands of the President of the Republic the resignation of the Cabinet.

It has been known for some time that the Briand Cabinet was facing serious difficulties, the exact nature of which is not entirely understood, as many of the questions which faced it were discussed in secret sessions of the Chamber. But it has been attacked for the failure of the Salonica campaign, its anti-alcohol program and its threat of a dictatorship. It is the third Cabinet to fall since the war began. The first definite news that the Cabinet was to be reconstructed came on March 16, when it was reported that the portfolios which had been combined when the Cabinet had last been remodeled were to be restored to their former status. The outgoing Cabinet formed December 12, 1916, consisted of a general Cabinet and a War Council, the War Council being formed of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Finance, War, Marine, and National Manufactures. The full Cabinet was as follows: Premier and Foreign Minister, M. Briand; Finance, M. Ribot; War, General Lyautey, who resigned on March 12; Marine, Admiral Lacaze; National Manufactures (to which were added the portfolios of Munitions and Transportations), M. Thomas; Interior, M. Malvy; Commerce and Agriculture, M. Clementel; National Subsistence and Labor, M. Herriot;

Colonies, M. Doumergue; Justice and Public Works, M. Viviani. There were also in office three Under-Secretaries under M. Thomas, with extensive powers: M. Loucheur for Munitions, M. Claveille for Transportations, and M. Godart for Sanitary Service.

General Lyautey's resignation seems to have been due to his lack of familiarity with parliamentary methods, which made him believe that he was the object of a political attack. He declined, however, to reconsider his action as long as the present relations between the Cabinet, which had outgrown the limitations imposed upon it by a political Parliament and a Chamber elected mostly on questions of internal policies before the war, continued to exist.

The first reorganization of the Cabinet took place on August 26, 1914, with M. Viviani still Premier. On October 25, 1915, a new Cabinet with M. Briand as Premier was formed. He had formerly been Premier in 1909, 1910, 1911, and for two months in 1913. On December 12 of last year, he constructed the Cabinet which has just resigned.

**Ireland.**—In discussing the Irish situation in the House of Commons on March 16, Andrew Bonar Law, Chancellor of the Exchequer, declared that the attitude

*The Chancellor's  
Speech; the Lloyd  
George Plan* of the Nationalists might compel an appeal to the country on the ground that the Nationalists were unwilling to permit the Government to go on with the war. Mr. Bonar Law's review of the Irish situation was a long one giving exclusively the Government's point of view. Among other things he said:

Nothing which has happened in the House of Commons since I have been a member seemed to me more deplorable than the lamentable result of our recent discussion of the Irish question. This was despite the fact that there exists among all parties a stronger desire than ever before to get some settlement of this vexed question. If good-will could do it there would be a settlement tomorrow. The whole House desires it, and I am not sure but that there is as much sympathy with the Nationalists in the country generally as in the Commons. The Nationalists have threatened to establish themselves as an opposition on old lines. But the Government cannot be conducted in times like these on the ordinary methods of party procedure, and it may be their procedure will compel an appeal to the country, this appeal being on the ground that the Nationalist members won't let us get on with the war. Surely there could be nothing worse than that. The Premier has already indicated that if there was any hope of results from the appointment of a commission he would be glad to consent, but he has received no answer from any of the Irish parties and we are now earnestly considering whether any action on the part of the Government is possible.

Mr. Bonar Law's statement was in reply to a question by Sir James Henry Dalziel, Liberal member for Kircaldy Burghs, who urged a statement on the situation, which he said was "important in a time like this, when revolution is in the air," adding: "In view of the grave state of affairs in Ireland, it is desirable that we have a

frank declaration from the Government as to the present position and future possibilities."

In reply to a question by John Dillon as to whether orders had been given to the people to remain indoors on St. Patrick's Day, Mr. Bonar Law said that Mr. Henry E. Duke, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, had gone to that country and that personally he knew nothing of the matter. Later he stated definitely that no orders had been issued confining the people to their homes on the day mentioned.

In political circles usually well-informed, it has been stated that Mr. Bonar Law's declaration that the Government is ready to set up a Commission to settle the Home Rule question will soon be followed by a definite offer to do so. The Irish Nationalists, considering that Home Rule is a thing already settled and a right due to Ireland and conferred upon it by Act of Parliament, refused to discuss the question. Friends of Lloyd George say that he has made up his mind that the Irish question "must be got rid of" and that if the Nationalists reject the offer or resort to obstructive tactics, a general election will follow, at which the Government will ask for a mandate "to deal peremptorily" with the whole Irish problem. To the Nationalists these words sound like a threat and they reply that the question could be settled by giving Ireland self-government.

**Russia.**—The first news that a revolution had taken place in Russia reached the outside world on March 15, though, according to the press, the movement began soon

after the Czar dissolved the Duma, **A Revolution** March 5, and strikers marched through the streets of Petrograd shouting for bread. Food riots followed, and the troops fired on the people killing or wounding some 200. M. Rodzianko, the head of the Duma, urged the Czar to appoint a minister of public confidence, but Nicholas took no action, and the revolt spread to the army. According to a Reuter dispatch dated March 16, the Executive Committee of the Duma has established a provisional government and issued the following appeal to the people:

**Citizens.**—The Executive Committee of the Duma, with the aid and support of the garrison of the capital and its inhabitants, has succeeded in triumphing over the obnoxious forces of the old régime in such a manner that we are able to proceed to a more stable organization of the executive power, with men whose past political activity assures them the country's confidence. . . . The new Cabinet will base its policy on the following principles:

(1) An immediate general amnesty for all political and religious offenses, including terrorist acts and military and agrarian offenses.

(2) Liberty of speech and of the press; freedom for alliances, unions and strikes, with the extension of these liberties to military officials within the limits admitted by military requirements.

(3) Abolition of all social, religious and national restrictions.

(4) Convocation of a constitutional Assembly, based on uni-

versal suffrage, which will establish a governmental régime.

(5) The substitution of the police by a national militia, with chiefs to be elected and responsible to the Government.

(6) Communal elections to be based on universal suffrage.

(7) The troops which participated in the revolutionary movement will not be disarmed, but will remain in Petrograd.

(8.) While maintaining strict military discipline for troops on active service, it is desirable to abrogate for soldiers all restrictions in the enjoyment of social rights accorded other citizens.

The Provisional Government desires to add that it has no intention to profit by the circumstances of the war to delay the realization of the measures of reform above mentioned.

The troops in Petrograd are reported to have placed themselves at the disposal of the Provisional Government, the Czar's chief Ministers are under arrest, fifteen provinces have given their adhesion to the new movement, and Czar Nicholas has abdicated the throne in favor of his brother Michael, saying:

#### *The Czar's Abdication*

We, Nicholas II., by the Grace of God Emperor of all the Russias, Czar of Poland and Grand Duke of Finland, make known to all our faithful subjects: In the day of the great struggle against a foreign enemy who has been endeavoring for three years to enslave our country it has pleased God to send Russia further painful trial. Internal troubles threatened fatally to affect the further progress of this obstinate war. Her heroic army, the happiness of the people, the whole future of the beloved fatherland demand that the war should be conducted at all costs to a victorious end. The cruel enemy is making his last efforts. The moment is near when our valiant army, in concert with our glorious allies, will finally overthrow the enemy. In these decisive days we realize we owe to the people a close union and organization of all forces for the realization of a rapid victory. Therefore, in agreement with the Imperial Duma, we recognize it is for the country's good that we should abdicate the crown and lay down supreme power. Not wishing to separate ourselves from our beloved son, we bequeath the heritage to our brother, the Grand Duke, Michael, with our blessing for the future throne, that he may govern it in full union with the national representatives and take inviolate oath to them in the name of our well beloved fatherland. We call all faithful sons of the fatherland to fulfil their sacred patriotic duty of obeying the Czar at this painful moment of national trials, and to aid him together with the nation's representatives to conduct the Russian State in the way of prosperity and glory. May God aid Russia!

But the Grand Duke Michael, according to a "semi-official Russian News agency," quoted by the press, while "accepting the throne from his brother, declares that he does so only with the consent of the Russian people, who should by a plebiscite establish a new form of government and new fundamental laws."

The Premier of Russia's new national Cabinet is Prince Lvoff; the Minister of War and Marine, Alexander Guchkoff, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs is Paul Milyukoff. According to a despatch from Petrograd, dated March 16, the Executive Committee of the Duma and committees of soldiers and workingmen have agreed to waive all minor differences until the meeting of the Constitutional Assembly which will settle what kind of government Russia is to have.



## Carranza, the Scourge of God

EBER COLE BYAM

THE revolutionary activity in Mexico has been a continued process of selection of the baser elements. This process was interrupted by the French intervention and the rule of the Emperor Maximilian, whose term, while short, still gave opportunity for a revival of the better element, which was permitted some slight expression under the later rule of Diaz. Slight as this expression was, it made possible a measure of religious liberty and the practice of thrift and industry. Moreover, debts were paid, a sound national credit was established, a surplus was laid up and millions were employed at good wages. To the rage and chagrin of the "Liberals," the Church began to prosper and its teachings improved the moral and material stamina of the people. Another generation of peace and prosperity in Mexico and the overthrow of government might have been impossible. During the whole rule of Diaz there had been repeated efforts to revolt; these met with repeated failure, largely because there was no sympathy in the United States with the destruction of law and order. Finally the revolutionists hit upon the happy scheme of "educating" the American public. This was done most effectively by means of a Socialist writer, who made a trip through Mexico under conduct of a Mexican guide and interpreter, who was also a Socialist. This American Socialist then wrote a series of articles for one of the American magazines, and the articles were widely copied and quoted. The magazine refused to complete the publication of the articles in question because a little investigation proved their utter falsity. But the seed had been sown and the promoters of the scheme had only to wait patiently for the harvest which came in due course. The American people read and believed the statements of this writer, with the result that when the Madero revolution broke out American public opinion prevented any restraining action, and, as a consequence, the Diaz Government was overthrown with little effort.

For every prejudice the Mexican revolutionist has an acceptable excuse. Is it against the Catholic Church? Then he justifies the villainies by tickling his hearer's hatred with tales of "Romish oppression," "great wealth of the clergy," a "priest-ridden Mexico;" not forgetting to mention the "efforts of the superstitious and reactionary clergy to keep the people in ignorance."

Is it a prejudice against "corporations," or "capital"? Then he has tales of "pernicious American speculators who have robbed the Mexican masses of their patrimony and left them poverty-stricken in a land of plenty, whose soil they cannot even call their own."

Is it a prejudice easily aroused through credulity and

morbid sympathy? Then he has tales of "slavery" and "peonage," and "people robbed of their lands."

The Mexican revolutionist poses as a modern knight-errant, avenging the wrongs of suffering humanity. In reality he is a demoniacal Socialist, ravishing, murdering and destroying, while the communities over which he tyrannizes sink deeper and deeper into the helplessness of despair. Those who would work are being driven gradually, through repeated robbery, into the ranks of the fighting Socialist bands where habits of pillage can only be cured by the firing squad.

That Mexico has had evils it were futile to deny. There have been practised all the frauds common to all the governments of man, in addition to those perpetrated by minority governments established by force. To political oppression have been added the abuses by wealthy corporations and individuals who have not hesitated to take advantage of the ignorant. And under all have flourished the ever-present ignorance, dirt and poverty.

The attacks upon wealth in Mexico have found much sympathy in the United States, where a growing feeling of resentment against wealth has created a spirit of envy which views with pleased complacency the spoliation of those reputed wealthy. To such an extent has this evil spirit developed in the United States that the mere suggestion that an individual possesses wealth becomes evidence that he is a criminal deserving most drastic punishment. The foundation of this resentment is often of the most trivial character. Perhaps the employee of some public-service corporation has displayed the discourtesy of an ignorant mind, thus arousing hot wrath in the injured patron, who thereupon condemns the corporation employing the guilty servant, and hastily assumes that the "wealthy" owners of the enterprise are the cause of the affront. Overlooking the fact that the real owners are thousands of modest people of moderate means, the insulted person in hasty judgment demands "government ownership" as a remedy for the fault, forgetting that the same guilty employee would continue as ignorant, and be emboldened in his impudence, under the protection of government employment.

Ninety-nine per cent of the complaints against men of wealth and great corporations can be traced to the overbearing manners of their subordinates, who, under any character of government management, would become intolerable.

A little reflection will discover the remedy to be a cheerful observance of the Ninth Commandment and the inculcation of a stricter discipline of morals and deportment whereby the "liberty" of insulting one's neighbor

will be compelled to give way before the "servility" of decent courtesy and respect for the rights of others.

Before the anarchical uprising in Mexico under Juarez, in 1856-7, the convents of that country were schools and colleges; their libraries contained books and manuscripts, and their archives were filled with statistical historical documents of great value. The fate of most of these institutions is illustrated by that of the Convent of San Francisco in Celaya. The group of buildings served as hospital, college, school, and, besides living quarters for the inmates, also housed a number of pupils who were present as boarders; many receiving free room and board, and all receiving free education. The revolutionists closed all but the hospital which was left to be operated by the Government on an appropriation of some six cents a day for each patient. They emptied the library and used the books and manuscripts and documents from the archives to make cartridges.

In 1876 the city officials tore off the tile roof to secure the cedar beams which were used to build a covered way, about half a mile long, down the main street, during a holiday celebration on May 5. The tiling was destroyed and the building left in a condition of utter ruin.

The Church of San Augustin, in the same city, possessed six large, carved, gilded altars, adorning the two side aisles. These works of art the revolutionists ground up and "panned" for the few dollars worth of gold-leaf used in the gilding. The bells they took down and

melted to make cannon, and the organ was destroyed to obtain the lead tubing for making bullets.

In 1859 the several cathedral archives of Mexico escaped damage, with all their records of priceless historic value, for the history of Mexico stood written through nearly four hundred years in the documentary files of the several bishops. These records in 1913 still stood practically intact, along with many valuable libraries. The triumph of Carranza saw the pitiless destruction of all this invaluable material, *for the barbarous Carranzistas emptied the libraries and archives of their records and books and sent them to the paper mill to be ground up as old paper.*

Churches may be razed, but other generations of men will reconstruct them; confessionals may be burned and images smashed, but all these can be recreated by loving hands; men, women and little children may be butchered, yet others will rise to take their places. But who can reconstruct, who can recreate, who can replace the destroyed and irredeemable historic records that had been accumulating through four long centuries?

Of all their murderous and destructive deeds, of all their outrageous and villainous conduct, this act stands out as the culmination of a career of stupid infamy, and brands the arch-fiend Carranza, with his horde of socialistic devils, a greater "Scourge of God" than Attila, a greater Goth than Alaric, a greater Vandal than Genseric.

## Animals, Environment and Adaptations

SIR BERTRAM C. WINDLE, M.D., Sc.D., F.R.S.

IT is hardly too much to claim that the story of living creatures begins, continues and, it might even be said, ends with the account of their adaptations to the environment in which they have to live.

The struggle begins with the first breath drawn by the new-born animal; it continues all its lifetime and ends with the victory of surrounding things, chiefly the oxygen of the atmosphere, when failing powers no longer permit the living organism to triumph over its difficulties. "Root, hog, or die" is a homely proverb, certainly true of all animals, for, whatever of truth there may be in the evolutionary theories of the day, of this law there can be no reasonable doubt that the organism which fails to adapt itself to its environment is on the road to destruction.

Man adapts himself consciously and carefully, even painfully, in his struggle to fit in with his surroundings. If he is to live in the Arctic regions he covers his body with furs and eats those fatty substances whose internal combustion tends to preserve warmth in his body, in the midst of his icy surroundings. If, on the other hand, he

inhabits the tropics he clothes himself lightly and, if he is wise, adopts a very different kind of diet from that which he would use, even in temperate climes.

If he is to pursue his warfare in damp, cold trenches, he discards the gorgeous regimentals in which soldiers went to battle at Waterloo, and even so late as the Crimea, and covers his khaki uniform, itself an example of protective coloration, with long rubber trench-boots and a huge coat lined with the skins of animals.

The lower animals do not, of course, carry an assortment of suits designed for different kinds of weather, though, as we very well know, some of them show seasonal changes or, as we may put it, change their clothes twice a year. Unconsciously, however, they do adapt themselves to their environment and carry out this process through some unknown power of response to outside factors, which is implanted in them. This is the true Lamarckian doctrine, now gaining much of the ground which it had once lost to the Darwinian view of accidental variations. False and exaggerated ideas of the Lamarckian theory almost amounting to the notion



that, for instance, an animal having arrived at the conclusion that horns would be a useful adjunct, immediately proceeded to grow them, have tended to discredit the doctrine in question. However, as properly propounded, it is eminently reasonable. Here, at any rate, we have one of the immense, immeasurable differences between man and the lower animals. The man who is going to the Klondike does say to himself: "I must get plenty of warm clothing before I start." This he does consciously and of his own will. We cannot suppose that those animals which adopt winter suits, do so consciously. Nevertheless the winter suits are adopted. But the object of this paper is not to discuss the Lamarckian and Darwinian theories, but to draw attention to a very curious group of parallel adaptations occurring in animals which, on those phylogenetic theories so dear to a certain school of naturalists, are very distantly related to one another; hardly less so than members of the human race are related to one another by their first forefathers, or than, on the transformist hypothesis, all living things are related to one another by the hypothetical primitive protozoon.

The ordinary habit of fish, as we all know, is to swim in water, fresh or salt. For that purpose they are provided with certain members, called fins, one pair of which, the pectoral fins, is attached to the lower part of the body, at the head end. Now it is useful for certain fish to desert, for short spaces of time, their natural element and to take to the air. For the purpose of doing this, these pectoral fins are broadened and lengthened so as to render them capable of sustaining their possessor in its flight. This is a remarkable enough modification, but what makes it much more remarkable is that it occurs not merely in one species of fish but in two, and these two belong to groups by no means closely allied to each other. Moreover, these groups are not even very like each other in appearance, for one is a kind of herring, a slim fish with narrow pointed head, whilst the other is a gurnard, quite a different-looking creature. Relationship clearly has nothing to do with this modification. We are not surprised when cousins, let us say, present similar peculiarities, since we at once say, "It is in the family!" But here is a very remarkable adaptation occurring in two very different families. It has arisen in each, no doubt, in response to a certain demand and it can only, so far as we can see, have arisen by means of some internal force which tends to development in favorable directions. It is not, however, among fish alone that this curious parallel development is to be observed. Both the porcupine and the hedgehog protect themselves with spines; yet the first is a rodent and the second an insectivore, that is to say they are, to put it very roughly, as far apart from each other as a cow and a lion.

By far the most curious examples in these series, however, are to be found in two sets of groups of animals, one belonging to placental, the other to non-pla-

cental mammals. These two great divisions include all the mammalia and are very widely separated from one another. The horse, the dog, the rabbit are examples of the placental group; the kangaroo, the opossum, the Tasmanian devil are examples of the other. The differences between these groups are of so fundamental a character that it is quite clear that, if they are phylogenetically related to one another, the point of divergence from a common ancestor must be a very long way back, right at the commencement of mammals in fact. Now in both of these great divisions are a series of families with absolutely parallel adaptations, which quite obviously cannot be explained in terms of relationship.

Thus, to commence with the less curious modifications, in both divisions are to be found carnivorous and ant-eating creatures, both of them modified in accordance with the kind of food which they affect. And these creatures are modified in like ways. Then, again, there are swimming animals, that is, animals which do more than swim when put into the water, as, for example, dogs do, animals whose main existence is spent in swimming, such as the otter among the placentalia.

Among the non-placentals there is a similar creature, the Yapock (*Chironectes*) which inhabits parts of South America and is almost wholly aquatic, living on small fish, water insects and the like. It is a kind of opossum, and here, it may be said, that the opossums (*Didelphys*) differ from all other present-day non-placentals in having their habitat on the American continent. We have seen that there are flying-fish and there are true flying mammals such as the bats.

But there are also so-called flying mammals which, though they do not actually propel themselves through the air by means of their wings as birds and bats do, yet are able when leaping from tree to tree to cover great distances, on account of the expanded folds of skin which extend between their fore and hind limbs and act as "planes" sustaining them for a certain length of time in the air.

This modification is possessed among placentals by the flying squirrels (*Pteromys*) which are rodents, and in the other division by the flying phalangiers (*Petaurus*). Finally, in both divisions are burrowing animals and, what is still more curious, these are divided into two classes in either division. Among the placentals there are burrowers with large eyes, such as rats and mice, which are rodents, and burrowers with insignificant eyes like the mole, which is an insectivore. Similarly among the non-placentals there are the bandicoots (*Perameles*) parallel to the rats and *Notoryctes* parallel to the common mole.

There are many other examples of what is called "convergence," but those which have been enumerated will serve to show what is meant by the term and to illustrate the curious parallelisms which exist and which, so it would seem, cannot be explained in terms of relationship.

## Bishop Kinsman and the Jesuits

JOHN F. CONOLEY

SO accustomed are we to the clever if unhistorical attempts of Anglican apologists and controversialists to discredit Catholicism, that the accusations made by Dr. Kinsman, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware, in his little book, "Outlines of the History of the Church," would not ordinarily call for contradiction. One realizes that phrase-making of the most futile and shallow sort, and juggling with fact are the stock-in-trade of many of that school of religious thought which Dr. Kinsman represents. He himself says of Anglicanism (page 65) that its characteristic quality is "habitual ambiguity." This statement should have been included in the preface to his little book. It might have helped his readers to form some accurate notion of the exact value of many of his statements.

Now no Catholic in his right mind expects to hear whole-hearted praise from the lips of an Anglican prelate. I use the word Anglican advisedly, since Episcopalianism is simply Anglicanism Americanized, with none of its virtues, and all of its vices, particularly snobbery, an exalted sense of "expediency," and a profound disregard for sober truth. One is not surprised, then, to find very general compliments discreetly mixed with the most sublime insults. In this regard, Dr. Kinsman is simply true to the type, the insults accentuated, of course.

There are, however, certain aged and "fantastic" lies that no longer find place in the writings of those who lay claim to any degree of scholarship, however small. It comes as a shock, therefore, to find the Bishop of Delaware dedicating to his godchildren the hoary old calumnies against the Jesuits.

We are told that the Jesuits taught a very pernicious system of moral theology, which allowed "that the end justifies the means," and that "probable opinions" were provided by these same unscrupulous persons "to meet every sort of emergency" (page 76). The Jesuits accepted the theory of "mental reservation," so the tale runs, by which men were taught that "it is quite honorable to lie, if only by a mental reservation they secretly mean the exact contrary of what they say." The Rt. Reverend historian then concludes that "many have justified revolt from the Roman Church by pointing to the lowering ethical tendency of these accredited teachers."

The truth of the matter is that the Jesuits never taught any such thing. This statement is made at the risk of hammering at the driven nail, but it simply must be repeated for the benefit of Dr. Kinsman's godchildren. Common-sense should suggest the obvious lack of proportion between the evil that would result from the universal application of such moral principles, and the fact that the Jesuits are pledged to work "for the greater glory of God."

The Jesuits have been charged with teaching that the end justifies the means, especially where the end concerns itself with the advancement of either Church or Society, ever since it was discovered that Busembaum, a Jesuit theologian, had made use of the expression *Cui licitus est finis, etiam licent media*, to whom the end is licit, the means thereto are also licit. The author made no universal application of the maxim, but applied it in his treatment of a very particular matter having to do with the marital relation. This, of course, makes no difference to Dr. Kinsman. His godchildren *must* get the "feeling that a low standard of morality was fostered by Roman influence," and that this was "increased in more recent times by the influence of the Order of the Jesuits" (page 75). That they should do so, in this case, at the expense of justice, is "expedient."

If Dr. Kinsman read Wageman, another Jesuit theologian, who makes use of the words *Finis determinat probitatem actus*, the end determines the honesty of the act, I am sure he overlooked the context. The author is very careful to apply the principle to acts that are in themselves indifferent, and to explain that the moral value of any specific act depends upon its object and the accompanying circumstances. This differs greatly from the odious charge made by Dr. Kinsman, i. e., that the Jesuits "applied this principle chiefly in justification of all acts which aimed at furthering the interests of the Church or Order."

No one has yet been able to cite one single instance of such criminal usage of the principle in question (save perhaps by Dr. Kinsman, when he misrepresents the Jesuits for the further edification of Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school children), and as late as 1905 an attempt to prove the charge in the civil courts of Trier and Cologne failed utterly.

I can quite understand that Dr. Kinsman's information concerning the Jesuits was not taken from the pages of either Busembaum or Wageman, or yet of Laymann. But he really ought to have consulted the "Encyclopedia Britannica" and the article therein contained, "Jesuits," by Littledale and Taunton, neither of whom can be accused of any too much prejudice in favor of the Society of Jesus. Dr. Kinsman would have been reminded that the doctrine of probabilism is "utterly misunderstood"; that it is not a nefarious bit of Jesuitry, but that it is "based on an accurate conception of law; that it is 'the principle of equity applied to law; that a probable opinion is one that is founded on reason and held on serious grounds' when it is not clear that it is the intention of the lawgiver to bind under certain circumstances. Dr. Kinsman has no proof for his assertion that the Jesuits provided 'a probable opinion to meet every sort of emergency' simply because many of them held and do hold that 'a doubtful law is, for practical purposes, no law at all,' and so superinduces no obligation. The good Bishop might have done well to reflect upon the fact



that there were many Jesuits among the fiercest partisans of probabiliorism.

So far as "mental reservation" is concerned, Dr. Kinsman knows perfectly well that no Jesuit, nor any other theologian, has ever given us leave to lie freely and without stint. I defy this prelate-historian to prove one single instance where a Catholic has accepted the theory that "it is quite honorable to lie, if only by mental reservation they mean the exact contrary of what they say." The refined malice of this statement is so obvious as to need no comment.

Writers of every creed have unhesitatingly admitted the lawfulness of amphibology when a sufficiently grave reason demands its use. I can easily imagine the good Bishop himself sending down word to more than one importunate caller that he is "not at home," mentally restricting the value of his words to mean that he is not at home to the person in question. Personally, I recall one venerable Anglican prelate, with whom I had business, gazing benignly at me from the parlor window and sending word by the maid that he was "out"!

I have before me the "*Theologia Moralis*" of a very famous Jesuit, who disposes of mental reservation in the following words:

It is never allowed to make use of mental restriction, properly so called, because, as is evident from the definition, this would be simply to lie. Sometimes, however, it is allowed for a just cause to make use of mental restriction in the broad sense, when the meaning of the speaker can be understood. This is not evil in itself, since one's neighbor is not, properly speaking, deceived, but for a just cause his deception is permitted. The good of society requires that there should be some means of licitly concealing a secret, and it often happens that no other means will suffice besides mental restriction. I have said for a just cause, since the use of such restrictions without a proportionate cause would render it impossible for one to believe another. This would be a grave danger to society. They are not blameless, [he continues,] who make use of mental restriction even in the broad sense if they do so (1) without sufficient reason and with the intention of deceiving; (2) if the person to whom they are speaking has the right of inquiry or is entitled to the truth, for such a right imposes the obligation of speaking the truth without ambiguity.

Such mental restriction may be employed by all public personages, secretaries, legates, doctors, surgeons, midwives, etc., who are questioned with regard to matters committed to their confidence.

But why continue? Dr. Kinsman either knew all this before he penned his charges against the Society, or he was totally ignorant. If he was aware of the truth of the matter, he is guilty of gross misrepresentation. If he was ignorant, he was totally incompetent to handle the matter at all, and honesty should have prevented him from making charges he could not prove.

It is true, of course, that Navarrus justified strict mental reservation. It is equally true that he was defended by Suarez and Lessius and bitterly opposed by yet another Jesuit, Laymann, who plainly and accurately states that a strict mental reservation is a lie, pure and simple. The theory of Sanchez as to the liceity of strict

mental reservation was condemned by Pope Innocent XI in 1679, and no Catholic theologian has since been bold enough to defend it. The whole question was fought out in the schools, and was handled only in theory as anyone who will take the trouble to read can ascertain. Dr. Kinsman, however, leaves us under the impression that the Jesuits taught such things openly to the people, and went about assuring the man on the street that he might save his conscience with probable opinions; that he might do as he jolly well pleased so long as he worked for the Church or the Society; and that he might say one thing and mean another, in other words that he might lie freely and without restraint; that the Jesuits were back of him, and that he might, in the language of the day, "go to it."

One realizes the impossibility of having Dr. Kinsman replace his slander with a sober statement of fact. Even though he were of a mind to do so, the truth could not be put, as the lie was, in one small paragraph. It would have been better to have left it out altogether, or to have said that such teaching was attributed to the Jesuits by some persons, beginning with Pascal, who divorced certain expressions from their contexts and then proceeded to draw conclusions. It may be that the "*Lettres Provinciales*," or even the "*Monita Secreta*" were the authorities used by the learned prelate. At any rate he is to be congratulated for the subtlety with which he contrives to keep alive old fires of hatred in younger hearts.

We can but be grateful to Dr. Kinsman for having implied (page 77) that the Jesuits are now reformed after two centuries of lowering standards and poisoning popes. He allows that "the Society has not, in its recent history, roused opposition similar to that it encountered in the sixteenth century."

In a paragraph descriptive of the genius of Anglicanism, the Bishop says that in the forming of the "Articles of Religion," "alleged charity sacrificed sincerity." He has murdered both charity and sincerity in cold blood, raising the old Jesuit ghost, this time to shock the superior morals of Protestant Episcopal Sunday-school children. The book is published for "The New York Sunday School Commission, Inc.," by the Young Churchman Co., of Milwaukee. It will serve as a vehicle to convey to yet another generation a very plain and unvarnished lie, masquerading under the appearance of historical fact.

Since these pernicious Jesuits have been responsible for an increase in the feeling that "a low standard of morality was fostered by Roman influence," the ultimate effect of Dr. Kinsman's literary effort will be to strengthen the dear little ones of his faith in what George Bernard Shaw calls "a conviction that Roman Catholics are socially inferior persons who will go to hell when they die, leaving heaven to the exclusive possession of ladies and gentlemen."

Isn't there a Scriptural passage very much in point here about the "deceitful witness that uttereth lies"?

## The Game of Raising Boys

M. J. RIORDAN

**R**AISING a boy is jolly good sport for one who has no boy of his own. One can plan the game from start to finish, and provide against slips, and arrange the situations and the cheers, and take care of the hitches, and have the score always on the ragged edge of a tie, and need not be at all shaky about the size of the wager. It is great fun, and is astonishingly safe and inexpensive. It needs no training or practice like golf or chess, and it leaves no sore spots like hockey or Rugby. It's fine fun.

Nothing good can hide itself for long in this nose old world, even humility gets caught. And so boyless society has come upon the game of boy-raising. It already has fast hold of it, and it is coming to be quite as serious a dissipation as bridge, and much more pathetic. It is well understood, of course, that the raising of a live boy by real parents is no sport. That is a business, or a luxury, or a battlefield, or a stampede according to the nature of the urchin in training. But it is inconceivable to picture it under the mild form of a pastime or an entertainment. Only the boyless can play it as a game; parents must work and groan: "for some must work while others play."

It is interesting to speculate upon the ways by which the instinct for boy-raising develops into a nuisance among the heirless. Perhaps a picture starts it into life, or a baseball match among noisy gamins, or the slouchy genuflection of a tousy-headed acolyte, or the uncanny courtesy of a sprouting Lord Fauntleroy who offers his seat on a trolley car to a weary old lady. How many have looked upon the original or a reproduction of Gustav Richter's painting of a "Neapolitan Boy," for example, and have forthwith launched into the wildest gambling on the game? The sapless bachelor or the purring maiden-lady who can look into those resistless eyes and contemplate that shock of tumbled hair, and the nestling of the medal within the dimple of the exposed throat, and hold back from ordering the life of the next unattached boy who comes in the way, is a hero and a heroine or a stalagmite and a stalactite.

The chances are favorable that bachelor or maiden-lady will push about the pawns of the lad's career until he is established on the foundations of the castle, and is washed behind the ears. It is safe to say that he will never have the gripes in his stomach, or the growing pains in his shins or the cramps in his calves. He will sweep right on through college and university, have his *wanderjahr*, set the world aflame with his voice or with the new chemical prune he will discover, and will finally lead "his people" into the new city which he shall build without walls.

And what interesting moves will show up in the game with the acolyte! To begin with, his hair will be cut, then his ribs will have to be padded out—he needs more proteids—that snuffling must be corrected; a minor operation for adenoids will do the work; his parents are impossible; they say "them things" and "I seen," and always put the accent on the second syllable of "lamentable"; also his father eats peas, and canned peas at that, with his knife. Altogether he needs fresh environment and a spray bath and peroxide of hydrogen for his chapped hands and bed-room wall-paper with the story of Siegfried splashed all over it in distemper. Then he will find himself, and will actually genuflect with his right knee, and will say "beg pahdon" when he is asked the time of day. O, it is an exciting adventure, this bringing up of other people's boys.

And it is incredible the number of excellent folk who are giving their time and thought to this ideal amusement. A vast number of teachers, from the grammar school to the university, are playing at it, and are serious about the stakes; the sectarian preachers who are shut out from more manly sports, are becoming dissipated over this form of recreation; settlement workers have the mania in a violent way, and precise gentlemen of middle age, who started in at the bottom as skinflints, and who have risen to wealth and power through the opportunity handed over to them by their easy neighbors, develop, in the stage of philanthropy that comes to all Gradgrinds, a keen appetite to upbringing (it is called in this case) other people's boys who are unlucky enough to catch their evil attention. All these types of people, and a multitude of others, simply must get into the game. As they have given "no hostages of fortune" themselves, there is no choice but to swoop down upon those of their neighbors, or of the poor and friendless, and to play their part with borrowed or captured flesh and bone. Charity commissions and school boards and women's clubs and settlement workers and Young Men's Christian Associations are for the most part professionals at the sport. The public provides the funds and the parents the living paraphernalia, and then the play is on full tilt, with no umpire and with little chance that the spectators will detect an occasional sly move, unless the players get in one another's way, which seldom befalls, for they are over and above all else gentlemen, and it is preeminently a gentleman's game.

There are no definite rules; each one has his own system, and the moves are as various as in checkers, and the object is the same as in that game, to get the boy in the king row; only the king row for a boy is not so well-defined as for a checker. And it is just this that makes



the difference in the two games. With checkers one king is as good as another, they are all wooden; with boys one king is not as good as another. They are all human. When you get a checker in the king row, a king it is; when you get a boy in the king row, he is like to be found not a king at all, but a cad or a caddie or a cab-driver, and then the game is up, and the player is too bald to begin another. But he had a good time while he was about it, and probably did much damage.

Beside the actual players at the game, there are a vast number who are devoted to the sport in a detached sort of way. They make a study of it, or at least affect to; they know the fine points, and while they do not take a hand, they are famous as promoters of the play and advisers to the players and judges of the raw boy material. The unfortunate parents of a likely boy may possibly escape the notice of the professional boy-raiser, or can throw him off on a false scent, or, if the worst comes, can knock him on the head with an especially brutal word; but no parent has yet been found who can dodge the amateur player, or the mere follower of the game. These latter are inevitable, like teething and German measles. They appear shortly after the christening, and forecast from the curve of the inferior maxillary, or the width of the suture of the skull, or the shade of the batting eye, the particular private or public school, and the particular curriculum, with decimal fractions omitted and sloyd in their place, that will best land Cyril at the age of twenty-one at the very head of everything worth leading. The educational horoscope will be founded on Fröbel or Montessori or Pestalozzi, and there will not be the least chance left for the harried parent to look forward to the day when his offspring may bring joy to the paternal heart by the skill with which his hardy son may set a horseshoe, plow a field or miter a door jamb. From the very cradle the vision of hard work for the heir of his loins, with its reward in peace of mind and sureness of digestion, will be swept away by the prophecy of the gamester. No "sweat of the brow" is to be in store for Cyril. He was born according to the forecast, with an eight-cylinder machine waiting for him at his majority. The bumps on his head clearly indicate a tenor voice of wide compass, a knack for leadership via the card-index route, and a pair of legs that can show off to advantage tailor-made trousers in the whirl of the cabaret. Cyril's destiny is fixed by the boy-raisers, and the parents must resign themselves to the line laid out for their crowing infant by their zealous friends and neighbors who are themselves innocent of issue, but are hardened in advice.

And so Cyril makes his way through infancy, a prophylactic baby, with his teeth cut according to Dr. Chavasse, and his "tummy" massaged according to Emelyn Lincoln Coolidge, and his consumption of calories measured out according to Dr. Kellogg, and emerges into anemic boyhood to wrestle with spelling after the sight style, and with fractions after the feel fashion and with

faith after the absent method. A course in football, tempered by some weak lectures on economics, and fancy dancing, and initiation into a Greek-letter fraternity, rounds out the days of his youth, and he steps across the threshold of manhood, the finished product of those who play at the game of raising boys just for the fun of the thing.

There is really too much interest taken in the raising of boys by those who own no such creature; too much dependence of parents on the advice of the professional gamblers in this line of sport, and too little attention given by distracted heads of families to the only true way to bring up a boy, and that is to bring him up just as little as possible, and at all hazards to protect him from the experiments of the faddists and dreamers and educational gamblers.

The unbaked educationalists have made of education a nightmare for parents. Once a man-child is brought into the world, peace flies out the door when admission is given to the advice of the nondescript horde of faddists who, like harpies, besiege the household. Parenthood and the upbringing of children should be, and normally is, a state of joyousness. It has been to a considerable extent turned into a state of distraction and anxiety by the professional adviser. They are the money-changers in the temple of the home. It will be a blessed day when they shall be scourged through its doorposts, and the parents can return to the work of leading their boys to man's estate in quietness, ease of mind and consequent efficiency, within the limits of their station. The result may be fewer doctors of the law, but more and better mechanics, and a notable increase in the happiness of families and of the world at large, and best of all, bringing up Cyril will be a pleasure instead of a disease.

## Upholstery

MICHAEL LARNEY, B.A.

WE live in an upholstered age. Cushions, Pullman-chairs, rubber soles and tires, shock-absorbers of one kind or another have become indispensable even for the most rugged lives. Physical contact with the world has to be softened. The senses have cried out against discomfort, and a considerable portion of the labor of the age is devoted to reducing to a minimum the ills that flesh is heir to. The valleys have to be filled up, and the rough ways made smooth, not to prepare for the coming of the "Strong Man of God," but to satisfy the requirements of a growing effeminacy.

Harsh sounds must be done away with; the business man's office must be noise-proof, his lady must have her luxurious limousine, the children and their boisterous prattle must be relegated to the nursery. Ugliness has to be banished. Restful colors must greet the tired eyes. Beauty, beauty everywhere: on impossible magazine covers, in dress and architecture. Soothing tints, and graceful lines must charm and refresh the jaded sight. Taste and smell also make their exactions. The old-fashioned nostrums are sugar-coated and disguised, the sweet spices and perfumes of Araby are in constantly increasing request. "The world is still deceived with ornament."

Man once accepted suffering as a part of his portion in this

vale of tears. Such an attitude, however, is hopelessly out of joint with the times. One of the modern triumphs is to have upholstered pain. "To grin and bear it," is no longer *au fait*. Sleep-producing drugs, once regarded with horror, are a commonplace both in surgery and medicine. Nowadays one sinks into a blissful lethargy, and awakes, as the case is, "sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste," but best of all sans pain. Cocaine, ether and heroin have a potent magic to interpose between consciousness and the jangling of quivering nerves.

The cat-o'-nine-tails has vanished from the school and home, but not because of greater docility on the part of the twentieth-century child. The whipping-post has given place to the divorce court. The prison-reform mania stalks abroad and endeavors to convert the penitentiary into a gentleman's retreat or club. There is no barbarity too flagrant to be palliated, no form of suffering too unimportant to escape attention. We are making a supreme effort to remove the dissonances from terrestrial life. Our very speech has been corrected, lest it jar on delicate sensibilities. Examination of conscience and sorrow for misdeeds have gone out of fashion, we now incline to new thought, esotericism and cosmic affinities, and by this and similar parlance, especially by incompatibility of temper, we gracefully drape over a multitude of sins—hush!—the term is not "sins," but "foibles," or better, "atavistic tendencies."

Religion, or at least the discomforting and harrowing portions of it, have met the same fate. Manifestly there could be but little of paradise on this orb of ours, soapstone it and bedizen it as we would, if we were doomed to suffer hereafter either for time or eternity. Therefore hell had to be upholstered. Some of the sects have retained at least tacitly, the doctrine of eternal punishment, but they have "put it up in a new form." As a result we have the evangelist who "in the language of the sidewalk," inspires by vulgar vituperation and "saves" by the process of shaking hands. He is the latest example of those who sugar-coat the old-fashioned pills of dogma. Others have ingeniously solved the difficulty by denying the very existence of the place of torment. Pain does not exist, either here or hereafter. Evil is a myth, and everything is good. A comfortable creed to be sure! Still others repudiate the very notion of a future life. The method is drastic but effective, provided one can only blind himself into accepting it. Not all have gone to such extremes, but even we Catholics have drifted a long way on the swelling tide without awakening to the reality of our danger.

Are all these merely unrelated instances of the progress of science and civilization, or do they signify a far more sinister tendency on the part of modern society? Are they only the hall-marks of luxury, or have they a deeper meaning? Rome loved the soft things of life, and we know where Rome ended. Science, however, has helped us to out-Nero Nero. Whither are we bound? Medical men tell us that we are becoming a race of neurasthenics. Is the present craze for upholstery of every fashion the cause or the effect of this depreciation in virility? Is the present movement to recede farther and farther not only from pain but from everything disagreeable and annoying in accord with Christian ideals? A recent instance of it points rather eloquently to the contrary. Only a short time ago a Catholic priest was refused a license to present a moving-picture of the Passion of Our Lord, "because of the harrowing scenes of cruelty which are depicted in the picture." Nothing could make clearer the antithesis between Christianity and the modern anti-suffering crusade. Christ's crown is made of thorns, and His throne is a cross. His kingdom is not of this world. His professed adherents need not be reminded that they too have a cross to take up daily, and that if they would arrive at a blessed eternity they have no choice but to follow Him. Pope Leo XIII expressed himself with unmistakable clearness on this subject:

Wherefore men are bound to consider and understand this above all, that it is contrary to the profession and duty of a Christian to follow, as they are wont to do, every kind of pleasure, to shrink from the hardships attending a virtuous life and to allow oneself all that gratifies and delights the senses. "They that are Christ's have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences" (Galatians v. 24.) . . . Therefore this is not a counsel, but a duty; and the duty, not only of those who desire a more perfect life, but of all—"always bearing about in our body the mortification of Jesus."

Here is the religious motive for the endurance of pain. History, however, adds other motives. The story of individuals and nations is an oft-repeated tale of strength and nobility and power won through suffering. Ease has ruined men and peoples, tribulation has made them great. Luxury saps virtue and ambition, hardship steels the human soul. In the garden of self-gratification and indulgence grow many vices. It is in the crucible of trial that hearts are purged of their weakness. "Had there been anything better for men's souls than suffering, surely Christ would have taught it by word and example." The Man of Sorrows is our model and guide. Padding has little or no place in Christian philosophy. There was no upholstery on the Cross.

## COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six hundred words*

### The Origin of Human Life

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

In a recent issue of AMERICA there appeared an article entitled "The Origin of Human Life," by Dr. Austin O'Malley. His opening sentence resurrected the old question concerning the moment the human soul enters the body. After airing the views of ancient, medieval and modern moralists he showed that there were, and still are, vast differences of opinion concerning this problem. Finally, to settle his point, he stated that the soul enters the body the moment that the nuclei of the two germ cells fuse to form the first cell of the embryo.

In the course of the discussion of this question Dr. O'Malley made some statements which I, as a biologist, cannot allow to pass without raising my voice in protest. Those Catholics who know nothing concerning biology might believe any biological statement simply because they saw it in a Catholic periodical while well-informed biologists not of our faith would have a perfect right to point to such printed assertions as a sample of "Catholic" biology.

Dr. O'Malley declared that the first human embryonic cell has seven attributes. Concerning the second of these attributes I would like further enlightenment, for he says that this first embryonic cell has a set of correlated organs. If Dr. O'Malley really means this, either he must have seen these correlated organs in the human one-celled embryo or he must have drawn his conclusions from observing them in the first embryonic cell of some lower animal, for Stöhr says: "Of the fertilization and segmentation of the human ovum nothing is known except by inference from lower animals." Martin affirms that "the actual process of the fertilization of the ovum has only been observed in the lower animals, but there is no doubt that the phenomena are the same in all essentials in all cases." Prentiss asserts: "In the earliest human embryos described by Teacher, Bryce and Peters, the germ layers and amnion are already present, indicating that they form very early. We can only guess at their early origin by what we know from other mammals." Therefore, Dr. O'Malley did not see these correlated organs in the human single-celled embryo. Furthermore, he cannot infer that they are there, for they have not been observed in any mammalian one-celled stage, for Stöhr also says: "The four-celled stage has been observed only



once and that in a monkey, while the youngest human embryo is already provided with ectoderm, mesoderm and entoderm." Hence I fail to see upon what authority Dr. O'Malley bases his assertion.

Again, according to Dr. O'Malley, "this single cell and nucleus divide into two cells which are the right and left halves of the human body at that stage." If this is true what becomes of the "correlated organs"? Furthermore, how does Dr. O'Malley combat the biological evidence that identical twins result from the complete separation and independent development of the two cells resulting from the first division of the fertilized ovum? Of course, if no separation of these two cells occurs, only one embryo results. At any rate, one cannot say that this primary fission results in the right and left halves of the body when it has been demonstrated in the lower forms that each of these resulting cells is capable of developing into separate and complete embryos.

In another paragraph of his article Dr. O'Malley makes the following statement with regard to skin grafting: "We graft this piece of dead skin on a living man and the live body juices seep into it, feed its cells; they finally start to proliferate, to live with the life of the new host." If this skin were dead, as Dr. O'Malley maintains, its individual cells would be dead. Then why feed dead cells with body fluid or anything else? When a thing is dead, it is rather too late to start feeding it. The truth of the matter is that the skin is not dead. If the cells of the skin were really dead they would not "grow, divide, function, and reproduce themselves"; yet in this same article Dr. O'Malley admits that the body cells do all these things. The fact that an animal is dead is no sign that the cells of its body are dead. If the cells are dead why do histologists first of all "kill" the tissue when they remove it from an animal they have previously killed? We may amputate a turtle's head and then remove its heart from its body. The turtle is dead. Yet its detached heart will continue to pulsate for some time because its cells are still alive. But drop the heart into formaldehyde, Zenker's fluid, or ten per cent nitric acid, and it will soon cease to beat because these chemicals kill the cells. If we could graft dead skin on a human body and make it grow there, why, in the case of a burn, for example, do friends of the victim often contribute several square inches of their skin when they could painlessly get some really dead skin from corpses in medical laboratories?

Dr. O'Malley furthermore declares that "in the human embryo, in the primordial cell, life is from life instantly, *after the corruption, or death*, of the life of the germ nuclei which are replaced by the newly-created substantial form of the new man. There is always an instant of time in which death, or corruption of the primitive form, intervenes between the corruption of one and the generation of the other." Does Dr. O'Malley mean to say that the two germ nuclei in the fertilization stage die immediately upon fusing to form the primary cell of the developing embryo, and that after their death, a new cell is created? If this is the situation then why have the intricate stages of oogenesis and spermatogenesis go to waste? "God never does useless work," and Dr. O'Malley admits this statement. Were either the male or female pronucleus to die in the fertilization process there would be no further development, for dead things do not develop anything other than an odor. Wilson says: "Life is a continuous stream. The death of the individual involves no breach of continuity in the series of cell divisions by which the life of the race flows onwards. The individual body dies, it is true, but the germ cells live on, carrying with them, as it were, the traditions of the race from which they have sprung, and handing them on to their descendants." Furthermore, Wilder states:

One of the greatest generalizations formulated by modern biological science is that of the continuity of life; that

the protoplasmic activity within the body of each living being now on earth has continued without cessation from the remote beginning of life upon our planet and that from that period until the present no single organism has ever arisen save in the form of a bit of living protoplasm detached from a pre-existing portion; that the eternal flame of life, once enkindled upon this earth, has passed from organism to organism, and is still going on, existing and propagating, incarnated within the myriad animal and plant forms of the present day.

Surely we cannot ignore the accepted views on biological questions when they are vouched for by such men as Stöhr, Wilson, Martin and Wilder, and I see no reason why Dr. O'Malley, in his effort to establish his proposition that the soul of man enters the body at the one-celled stage, need assume that a period of death is present in the process of the formation of the one-celled embryo by the union of the two gametes. Such an assumption is contrary to all biological evidence.

Washington, D. C.

G. J. BRILMYER.

#### To the Editor of AMERICA:

In commenting upon Dr. O'Malley's article on "The Origin of Human Life," Mr. Elder (AMERICA, January 13), states: "All moralists have held: when there is human life there is a human soul. It is for the scientists to say when there is human life; the moralists can only accept their verdict."

One of the most difficult problems of biology is the definition of an individual. Disregarding such organisms, both plant and animal, which reproduce by stolons, runners, by fission, fragmentation, etc., the following evidence may be of interest: (1) Experiments with the eggs of sea-urchins. After the sea-urchin embryo has begun the series of cell divisions which ultimately lead to the formation of the adult sea-urchin, the component cells may be shaken apart, or they will fall apart when placed in sea water of less than normal concentration. Each of the cells thus separated will resume its divisions and eventually form a complete adult. This experiment may be continued until the 64-cell stage of the embryo, I believe. Potentially, then, the fertilized eggs of a sea-urchin constitute not one, but sixty-four individuals.

If an embryo of sixty-four or more cells be cut into pieces of varying size and number, each of these, regardless of the number of cells composing it, will eventually form a complete animal, reduced in size, but structurally and physiologically complete. Again the number of potentialities exceeds the actualities.

Cut a starfish into five pieces, each with a portion of the central disk attached; the pieces will regenerate into five complete starfish. The experiment may be continued with the regenerated starfish.

(2) Let us take a step higher in the animal kingdom, the Ascidians, regarded as degenerate vertebrates. Hans Driesch cut the branchial basket of Ascidians into pieces of varying number and size. Each of the pieces rounded up into a small clump. From each clump there ultimately grew a new individual, as complete as the individual from which it originally came. Histological examination demonstrated that the tissues composing the clump had undergone histolysis (breaking down) and returned to the embryonic, *i.e.*, undifferentiated, condition. This same return to an embryonic condition has been demonstrated by Childs in regenerating flat-worms, and by other investigators in frog tadpoles, etc.

Since each regenerating piece returns to an embryonic condition it may be deduced that each embryo constitutes potentially not one, but many individuals. Thus, as Driesch says, a 64-celled sea-urchin embryo is not merely one complete individual, but "an aggregate of harmonious, equipotential systems." If the embryo be shaken apart into sixty-four pieces, it is shown that potentially every cell of the sixty-four is a complete

system (individual), although constituting only part of the single 64-cell embryo. This potentiality is reduced as the animal advances in its ontogeny, especially after the definite formation of its three germ layers has begun. That this equipotentiality of its component parts is not entirely lost, is indicated by the starfish and Ascidian experiments alluded to.

(3.) The frog. In the two-cell stage of the frog embryo either cell may be killed (by puncturing, burning). The remaining live cell will produce half a frog or a whole frog, depending on the fact whether the dead cell is left attached to the other, in which case half a tadpole grows up, or is completely removed, when a whole frog results. In fact, the two cells may be separated artificially, and two complete frogs will grow up, which are normal in every respect. Yet originally they constituted one individuality, in the sense of Dr. O'Malley's definition.

(4.) Among mammals, the case of the armadillo is remarkable. A single egg is fertilized. The embryo develops normally to the blastula stage (2-cell, 4-cell, 8-cell, etc., through morula, solid-ball stage, to blastula, hollow-ball stage. I am using the simpler technical terms.) The blastula then constricts and divides into four parts, *each of which ultimately forms a complete armadillo*. In the fertilized egg, the union of the pronuclei produces *one* individual. This individual continues one until the blastula stage (properly "blastoderm"). It would be difficult to say at which point of the blastular constriction this one individual should be regarded as four individuals, or one entelechy as dividing into four entelechies.

In man, some very significant evidence may be cited. I refer to the case of the so-called "identical twins." These always are of the same sex, and exhibit such marked mental and physical similarities, extending to minute peculiarities of structure, habits, and thoughts, that the assumption of identity in origin seems warranted. The supposition is that as in the case of the sea-urchin embryo the two cells of the 2-cell stage failed to adhere to each other, with the result that, each cell being equipotential, a complete embryo and later adult was formed from each cell.

This supposition is, of course, not capable of demonstration or experimental proof. But from the standpoint of biological analogy I believe that the supposition is fully justified. On the other hand, it would be equally difficult to prove that it was *not* a blastula that was constricted, as in the case of the armadillo, normally; or experimentally in sea-urchins, etc., and divided into two. Whichever it be, it can be safely concluded that the individual produced by the fusion of egg and sperm nuclei is potentially more than one individual.

Regeneration experiments have shown that most animals possess such a potentiality complete or in part. This is demonstrated by the experimental duplication of parts, such as limbs, tails, heads, etc., (tadpoles with two or four legs where one should grow, two-headed monsters).

As regards man, the question arises, is the soul part of the individual or is it added thereto? If the soul of each being is indivisible and wholly that being's own, can we say with assurance that, as Dr. O'Malley states, it is a concomitant of pronuclear union? Or is it imposed upon the embryo at a later date?

Biologically, the original zygote (fertilized egg) constitutes one individual that as it continues to be divided is composed of a progressive series of "harmonious equipotential systems" (Driesch); but, as Dr. O'Malley would have it, with one soul. Upon separation, in the case of identical twins, each of the two cells in the two-cell stage (which, remember, are equipotential) may form a complete individual, or, according to Dr. O'Malley's logic, really two half-individuals with half a soul apiece.

While it is a platitude to say that the eggs of a species will

not bring forth individuals of another species; and while the makeup of a particular individual is immutably determined by the constitution of the particular sperm and egg which go to form the zygote, yet it seems unsafe to postulate an investment of the zygote with the soul. That is, the character of the individual, mentally, morally, and physically, is fixed, except for the later environmental modifications; I was I at the moment of pronuclear union, yet did my soul enter at the moment of union?

The facts of regeneration, especially the return to an embryonic condition, seem to indicate that there is a certain point to be reached from which differentiation can again proceed. This point seems to be a relatively "unorganized" stage, yet approximately about the same as the morula (ball of cells) stage of most animals. Can this be the point where the organism is "individualized"? Or, in man, the period at which the soul enters?

Whichever it be, the possibility that one zygote may potentially comprise, and form, two complete individuals, must be considered seriously in any discussion of the entry of the human soul. And, as I have said, it cannot even be shown that identical twins are *not* formed through an accidental (or perhaps normal?) division of the *blastula*; hence a much later stage than the 2-cell stage. Embryologists generally assume the "two-cells-falling-apart" hypothesis as an explanation of the origin of identical twins. Yet this evidence is sufficient to cast serious doubt on Dr. O'Malley's sweeping definition of the origin of human life.

Columbia, Mo.

R. A. MUTTKOWSKI.

#### The Much-Abused Doctor of Medicine

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"By my beard," as one of your esteemed contributors frequently remarks, I am "sore distressed" by the repeated flings at our honorable profession. The doctors charge too much, the surgeons charge outrageously. This is the cry everywhere. Why is the real-estate agent, who frequently "turns over" \$5,000 in twenty minutes, free from censure? Why is the stockbroker allowed to live in peace and plenty and a mansion? The pedlar, who cries "rags, bottles and bones," owns the house in which the bloated octopus of a surgeon lives and drags his slow life along. How many men in the medical profession own houses at Newport, Palm Beach and other airy-nothing places? "Avast and make a note of it." While the butcher and baker and candlestickmaker, not to mention the plumber, are bleeding the doctor for all they can get, the latter, poor man, is bleeding a patient for charity at St. Mary's Hospital.

New York.

J. B. PROVIDENCE.

#### Help for Philippine Missionaries

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for November 18 you published a report of the Right Rev. Dr. Hurth, Bishop of Nueva Segovia, Philippine Islands. May I add a few lines to show the necessities of a part of that diocese, for I am one of the Belgian missionaries the Bishop speaks of in his letter? In the Mountain Province, which is inhabited by non-Christian tribes, there are in all sixteen Belgian missionaries. We have schools attended by more than 3,000 pupils, many of whom rely completely on us not only for education, but even for food and clothing, and during 1915 the schools cost us more than \$4,000. The Jones bill forbids the Government to help us financially, and the war has stopped all our supplies from Belgium. Though all the missionaries have reason to complain of losses on account of the war, I think the Belgian missionaries have more reason than



others, for it is impossible to communicate even with our relatives who used to support us, and we have no houses outside of Belgium to help us as other societies have. We are on the point of being forced to close many of the schools we have among non-Christians. The work of years is going to ruin. Some 20,000 Catholics require the schools, and about 300,000 heathens need them even more. Protestants threaten with their abundant means to spoil the harvest which is ripe, and we only ask for more men and more schools. Almost all the heathens are disposed to receive Baptism. In my district I have about 20,000 heathens, who on each of our visits to their towns beg for Baptism, but we have to put them off because they have not sufficient knowledge of the Church's doctrine.

(Rev.) C. VANDEWALLO.

Tagudin, (Mountain Prov.), P. I.

#### Percy Covington.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

At last Percy has come from cover, evidently thinking that he is safe from the wrath of his abused sister, Julianne. Be that as it may, he has done a good thing in exposing his weakness. His is a common story, the tale of a lad who was never taught to do for himself. Many others have a similar history, and they were not educated in non-sectarian institutions either, but in Catholic colleges. Too much is done for our boys and girls: they are not taught to do for themselves. As a consequence, they are lacking in courage and initiative and other qualities necessary for success in the mad battle of life.

New York.

FRANCES RUSH.

#### A Publicity Plan

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I call attention to the proposal of *Extension Magazine* in the March number, not for the purpose of boosting that magazine, but simply to commend the excellence of its proposal and to suggest the possibility of a more varied and wider application of its scheme? The editors are getting out a special number on the "Mexican question," and they desire to place this number in the hands of non-Catholics who are the molders of public opinion in the land, editors, senators, congressmen, colleges, libraries, etc., and to this end they are asking their subscribers to cooperate with them by sending in the names of the supposed formers of public opinion in their respective localities, the subscribers to pay for the magazines to be sent to such individuals or organizations.

Here at last is a move in the right direction. In our Catholic newspapers, magazines, truth society publications, etc., we professedly aim at reaching and affecting public opinion outside the Church, but we might as well be living under the *Disciplina Arcani*, so little do we employ the right means to attain that end.

We know that we have the solution of the many and mighty problems that threaten society in our day, but outsiders do not know it, and will never know it until we show them. We cannot expect the *Menace, et hoc genus omne*, to set forth our excellent power. We know the secular press is not feverishly planning and working to extend our kingdom. If the work is to be done, we must do it ourselves, and it may be done without much labor, but with a little enterprise, viz.: a further extension of the *Extension* scheme.

Let us organize a publication society, or utilize a department of some truth society already existing, whose *special purpose and aim* will be to reach and mold outside public opinion. Make the organization national, with promoters, preferably the

clergy, in different parts of the country, e.g., in each diocese, to advocate and advance the work by soliciting money to carry on the work, and sending in the names of those to be reached and enlightened. On all important questions turn on the light by sending out ably written pamphlets, such as the *Catholic Mind*, and enlist the aid of Uncle Sam to work for us, instead of against us. Here is a simple, ready, inexpensive and effective means to an end that is greatly desired.

We have the power, but it is static rather than dynamic. We have the organization, according to the latest report, "nineteen millions strong," but there is a loose connection somewhere. Will not one start the machine agoing? Or is Our Lord's rebuke against our lack of enterprise to be forever true: "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light"?

Hallowell, Me.

J. H. CAREY.

#### Doctor McConnell's Intelligence?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

"Rev. S. D. McConnell, LL.D., D.D." (I am quoting from the *North American Review*, issue for March), "was rector successively of St. Stephen's, Philadelphia, Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, and All Souls Church, New York. He is a well-known writer on church literature, and some of his more familiar books are 'History of the American Episcopal Church,' 'Essays, Practical and Spectacular,' 'The Evolution of Immortality and Christ.'"

Let us take a text from "Doctor" McConnell's article for a very brief meditation. The citation is to be found on page 425 of the March number of the *North American Review*:

Why is it that the Catholic Mass and Billy Sunday's "sawdust trail" grip as they do? They are essentially identical, although apparently so unlike, both being the exhibition of the same idea, "propitiation"—the crassest and crudest theology, acceptance by "faith" of wonders which the intelligence rejects, a trust for salvation to a goodness which is not one's own but imputed. We are perplexed when we see men of high intelligence kneeling in adoration at the Mass.

Let us now take for our composition of time and place tomorrow morning at Malines in Belgium. In a small oratory a tall, spare, white-haired man stands at the foot of the altar in priestly vestments, with bowed head, as he repeats the *confiteor* and strikes his breast three times, saying *mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa*. Who is this man? He is Desiré. Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines. All the world today knows who and what he is. The founder of the Louvain Philosophical Institute, a school which three years ago represented the very vanguard of sound and scientific thought in the twentieth century, he is a man whose philosophic powers have extorted the admiration of many of his bitterest opponents, a man who has veritably incarnated in himself the *lex aeterna*, so that he flames athwart the hideous wrack of injustice like the sword of the angel at the gate of Paradise, a man whose voice thunders like the last trumpet through the horrible tumult of the guns. This man it is who bows himself down at the altar of God each morning as he prepares to celebrate the Sacrifice of the Mass. This is the man whom "Doctor" McConnell finds "perplexing"; this is the man whose "crudest and crassest theology" "Doctor" McConnell's *intelligence* rejects!

What are we to conclude from this short meditation as to the nature of "Doctor" McConnell's intelligence? And what as to the "intelligence" of the editor of the *North American Review*, who offers "Doctor" McConnell's intellectual product to his readers?

New York.

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK.

# AMERICA

## A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1917.

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;  
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00  
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

### Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

*Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.*

*Contributions to the Mission Literature Fund may be sent direct to AMERICA.*

### Pastor Chiniquy, Robert Speer, "Cardinal" Liguori

PASTOR Chiniquy was a foul creature, a fallen priest, an apostate scored for theft and treachery and lechery. Robert Speer is the holy evangelist of 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, where Presbyterians, elect and otherwise, can foregather in groups to gaze on an indecent phallic image which is exhibited as a Romish idol. "Cardinal" Liguori is a saint of God. There is the difference between these three men. There is a connection between them too, a relationship based on a hideous calumny. This is the story: Robert Speer pretended to quote the Saint, to prove that priests are as an abomination of the beast. The charge had a familiar ring. Whence did it come? From Robertson, said the enmeshed Robert Speer, the elect of the sanctified tongue so nimble in quoting fancy as fact. But the lie is older than Robertson, probably its origin is nearer the bottomless pit. At any rate it peeps out of an unspeakably vile book, a purveyor of indecency, written years ago by Pastor Chiniquy.

Now begins the second part of the story, wherein is found a repetition for the sake of emphasis. After a scandalous life Chiniquy was suspended from priestly functions, in Canada, September 28, 1851, and again in Chicago, November 20, 1856. He became a Protestant and was twice denounced by his new co-religionists, once by the Presbyterians themselves. Like all his kind, he wrote indecent, untruthful books of a nature to pollute souls. Robert Speer on the other hand is that holy man, who not long since fell into a paroxysm of virtue over a Panama lottery and, as usual, stated fancy for fact; he is that zealous man who gave currency to a spurious,

calumnious Bull against South American clergy, and pretended to quote a saint in order to fasten the badge of infamy on the priesthood; he is more than all that, he is a Presbyterian enthroned at 156 Fifth Avenue, where the Fleming H. Revell Company, the Presbyterian "publishers of evangelical literature" handle Pastor Chiniquy's filthy books. There is the whole story, and it has a moral, but Robert Speer will not see it. However, perhaps, by a preordained decree he is destined to compare Pastor Chiniquy and St. Alphonsus, a lottery and the dissemination of gross books. In that day calumny may cease.

### Sentimentality and Ethics

A GREAT deal of sentimentality is masquerading through the world today in the guise of ethics. To novel and magazine readers in particular moral fallacies are making an insidious appeal, not because of any intrinsic strength, but because of the manner in which they are proposed. Stripped of dramatic setting and subjected to calm judicial scrutiny, these false principles of conduct would not pass muster even before an uneducated mind; but the novelist is too clever to discuss them or attempt their justification. He merely enunciates them as the solution for difficulties of his own creation, putting them on the lips of characters otherwise very attractive. Sober reflection would repudiate them at once; but when cleverly insinuated in the midst of a warm glow of emotion and in the course of a narrative that is too rapid or too absorbing to permit of dispassionate judgment, they have a certain subtle persuasiveness, and if disguised with sufficient cleverness and expressed with enough verbal grace and vagueness, they have a kind of plausibility that in time acts like a poisonous gas and clouds, where it does not destroy, correct standards of action.

An example in point, chosen because it crystallizes a thought much in vogue at present, is taken from one of the latest novels. Pausing in the midst of a climax of intense feeling and at the moment when the hero is formulating high resolves for future conduct, the writer says, "Jean was no moralist, but he had his own ideas of sacrilege; marriage without love was sacrilege to him and children born of a loveless marriage were ethically illegitimate." The author might have spared himself the remark about Jean's capability as a moralist. Apparently pleading for something sacred, in reality he is merely voicing the common plea for divorce and striving to break down one of the strong supports of moral life. If marriage without love is sacrilege and the children born of loveless marriage come into the world with a stigma upon them, it follows that such a relation should be severed at once; it is wrong and unjustifiable. The expressions "sacrilege" and "ethically illegitimate," are chosen with special care. They confuse two well-defined terms, hide a hideous meaning under gracious language,



put a halo of high moral rectitude about a wholly unethical principle. In its unadorned falseness, the moral of this immoral novelist signifies that whenever a man's passing fancy has lightly strayed from his wife to some other woman, he is bound in conscience to break his solemn promise, and basely desert the woman who in the morning of her life put her happiness in his keeping. It sanctifies the sinful withdrawal of his affection from his legitimate consort, and it idealizes the shameful crime of legalized adultery.

Sentimentality and ethics are poles apart; they should not be confounded. The former is the expression of exaggerated emotion, unapproved by sober judgment and uncontrolled by strength of will; the latter is the unalterable moral code, based on evident principles evolved by sound reasoning and guaranteed by the sanction of Divine retribution. The one panders to selfish egotism, the other, irrespective of personal inclination, insists on the fulfilment of stern obligation. In the present instance the sheep's clothing is so thin a disguise that it is remarkable how any one can fail to recognize the impostor.

#### The Ordinary Man

**Y**OU do not hear a great deal about him. He never wrecked a bank, or formed a society for the relief of destitute Senegambians, nor has his name been blazoned in flaring headlines. He is not wealthy, but he is likely to be happy, and generally, he is very wise. He works hard in an inconspicuous position, takes an occasional vacation, is good to his wife, and is regarded by his children as the best and wisest of men. But the world does not think enough about him either to affirm or deny this verdict. He is merely "an ordinary man."

And yet it is on him, the ordinary man, who day after day plods along the road of simple humdrum duty, that the stability of our civilization depends. The genius is apt to be an unpleasant neighbor; society, above whose laws he often places himself, usually pays a generous price for his undoubted services. But the ordinary man is so busy providing for himself and for those who depend upon him, that he has no time to work out disturbing, unsettling theories of class-distinctions and social reform. He is a builder, not a destroyer. He takes the world as he finds it, and tries to improve that part of it in which he lives.

With more than a touch of condescension do we call him "ordinary," not reflecting that the man who works according to order in all things, works according to Heaven's first law. He does not look for great things, forgetting life's simple duties, but fulfils each duty as it comes to hand. His virtues are of the homely type; love of his family, fidelity to his friends, simple uprightness in every point of life. He sometimes wonders how so fine a woman ever agreed to become his wife, and as for his children, he regards them as true gifts from God. Not rich himself, he always has something for

those poorer than himself, for he knows what want is, and has schooled himself to sacrifice.

That is the secret of the ordinary man's greatness, "sacrifice." "The more I see of men," someone once wrote, "the more I think of my dog." The man who can find that lesson in life, is unworthy the companionship and regard of any well-bred canine. No one so loved men as He who knew them best. The deeper our knowledge of men, the clearer will be our recognition of the good that is in them. For most men are "ordinary" men, and all, sage and simple, sinner and saint, are made in His image.

#### Dynamite and Wages

**T**O dynamite your employer's factory is an exceedingly poor method of inducing that gentleman to give you an increase in salary. The explosion will certainly lift the factory, but it can scarcely be expected to lift the dynamiter in the esteem of the factory's owner. On the contrary, it is apt to hurt his feelings, to arouse sentiments at least transitory, of resentment, and if after the explosion he has no factory for you to work in, it does seem just a trifle unreasonable that he should be expected to increase your weekly stipend, or to give you any at all. Furthermore, if your activities in the dynamiting come to the notice of the police, you will probably not feel any immediate need of a weekly stipend, for you will be a guest in one of the State's penal institutions. Viewed from any angle, the conclusion seems valid, that while dynamite will always raise a factory, it rarely raises a salary.

This conclusion is respectfully recommended to the labor "agitators" now at large, who loudly proclaim themselves "the friends of labor," and who, unfortunately, are accepted at their own valuation by too many American workingmen. Last summer, a misguided young man whose only crime, according to his legal counselor, was his "imprudent devotion to his union," placed a charge of dynamite in a subway station. The plot, had it succeeded, would have involved a loss of possibly a million dollars, a large sum, but a trifle, after all, to the corporation controlling the transportation facilities of New York. It would also have involved death to many innocent citizens, most of whom sincerely sympathized with the strikers. But it could never have bettered the condition of the striking operatives, or have recommended their cause to the public. The sole result of this misguided young man's plot is an increase of distrust in labor organizations, and for the young man himself, a ten years' penal sentence, imposed on the very day that had been fixed for his marriage.

When will the worker learn that in a civilized community, violence always defeats its own ends? And when will organized labor realize the absolute necessity of a prompt condemnation of the apostles of violence in its own ranks and without? In the railroad strike just

averted, not the railroads, which have entrusted their case to the courts, but organized labor was on trial. If this strike had been staged to employ duress on the Supreme Court, the speedy dissolution of the railway brotherhoods will be a blessing not only to the country, but to the worker.

#### Investigating the Foundations

A BILL has been introduced in both branches of the New York legislature, calling for a repeal of the law under which the Rockefeller and similar foundations, hold their charters. The sponsors of this bill do not, apparently, look for its passage. Their main intention is to bring before the public the purpose and work of the Rockefeller foundation in New York.

The belief that an investigation, if not imperative, would serve a useful purpose, is shared by many. Hitherto confining themselves largely to education and medical research, there are indications that the foundations are now prepared to arrogate functions properly belonging to State and municipal governments. If this be true, the sooner an investigation is ordered, the better for representative government. No government can countenance a government within, and independent of, itself. If the State or municipality is now ready to depute its authority to these private foundations, ample notice should be given and the responsibility clearly fixed. The foundations have been wont to claim that they are responsible in their work to "the public." That claim is vague and unsatisfactory. The opinion is fast becoming common, that the sole and final responsibility of these hugely financed foundations is to the monopolists whose names they bear.

If this opinion is erroneous, the foundations can have no difficulty in demonstrating its falsity before a legislative committee. Devoting a large share of their energies to the task of "investigation," they have hitherto escaped any investigation of their own activities. As a specific for present evils, and as a remedy against possible disorders, nothing, we have been told, can equal "full publicity." Let the foundations gracefully follow their own prescription. The result will not be the suppression of their beneficent work, where this exists, but due regulation.

#### A Discord of the Soul

GREAT thoughts, says the Marquis de Vauvenargues, come from the heart. Born there in the very sanctuary and stronghold of life, they instinctively clothe themselves in perfect beauty of form, their natural vesture. The noble thought is ever expressed in noble yet simple words. Strong through its own inherent power, it thrills, or it soothes with the majesty, or the sweetness of its message.

The man who is impatient of moral rule will not hear the echo of the noblest thought resounding in his heart. Only he whose heart is attuned to the great message of

the immutable laws of God will feel his heart thrill to the music of those heavenly inspirations which afterwards sway the acts and the lives of men. As Charles Kingsley says: "If the spirit be impatient of all moral rule, its utterance will be impatient of all artistic rule."

The man who by his unchivalrous attack on one of the truest knights that ever lived, called forth in reply Newman's "Apologia," here at least finds us echoing his words. Writing many years ago, he seemed to foretell the time when, because they lacked inner moral vision and moral equilibrium, men would throw off all artistic control. He has splendidly described our imagists, post-imagists, vorticists, impressionists, the ballad-mongers of the *vers libre*, the poetical acrobat and contortionist, now so loudly clamoring for recognition for their false literary wares. He writes:

We shall have . . . a wider and wider divorce of sound and sense, a greater and greater carelessness for polish, and for the charm of musical utterance, and watch the clear and spirit-stirring melodies of the older poets swept away by a deluge of half-metrical prose run-mad, diffuse, unfinished, unmusical, to which any other meter than that in which it happens to have been written would have been equally appropriate, because all are equally inappropriate; and when men have nothing to sing it is not of the slightest consequence how they sing it.

The form is warped and distorted, because the being which it clothes is a shapeless and incoherent mass. The structure reared upon foundations lacking unity, coherence and strength must necessarily be flimsy and insincere and must inevitably fall. There is no music in the verse, in the song, in the book because there is discord in the soul.

#### In Happy Kansas

IF perfect happiness is in any way connected with piety and progress, then perfect happiness can be had for the asking in the State of Kansas, for Kansas is both pious and progressive.

When prohibition was but a tender infant in the family of national qualities, whose coming had been devoutly longed for with sighs similar to those of the English Puritans yearning for the downfall of "Popery and prelacy and Peveril of the Peak," Kansas opened wide her maternal arms and welcomed the youngling to her Kansan bosom. Then there arose a righteous man, a sort of combined Solomon and Solon with more hardihood than either of these wights, who proposed to the State legislature of Kansas that it make it a misdemeanor for any female in that Commonwealth, to refuse to admit that she had reached the forty-five-year mark, to appear on the public streets wearing ear-rings, or with the roses on her blushing cheek betraying an intimate acquaintance with the powder-puff or the rouge-pot. It was an ungallant piece of legislation that would force any Kansas lady to acknowledge that she was a "quinquagenarian" before she might legally powder her nose: and the Kansas lady has the vote!



And now the men, the plain ordinary family men, the bachelors and widowers and the young lads in their first long trousers, in Kansas, are to know what it means to live in a State that has a legislative conscience. For according to the press, another righteous man, a Mr. O. P. Jewett, who is a member of the Kansas legislature, has introduced a bill to prohibit any kind of a man from smoking tobacco in any kind of form, either on the street, in any public conveyance, or even in his own office.

But the prohibition would not end there. For the Kansas man may not smoke even in the secret recesses of his own home, if so be the house should happen to shelter any little Kansans of tender years, which is an

arbitrary way of making a Kansas husband choose between his pipe and his progeny. Nor, as it appears, would a Kansan be allowed to smoke in his club, save in some remote and subterranean dungeon set apart, like the bottomless pit, for such smoky purposes.

So, with the passing of the pint pot, the pipe, and the powder-puff the millenium is to come, and the reign of the saints is to begin, and righteousness will become indigenous to the soil of the Middle West. Meanwhile, it behooves the Kansas legislature, as guardian of the public conscience, to expand the Decalogue, and to explain to the more scrupulous of the Faithful under which of the seven deadly sins the use of talcum powder and Bull Durham falls.

## Literature

### TALK AND THE NEW POETRY

WHEN, some four or five years ago, in this country readers of verse first began to observe in newspapers, in magazines, and even in books, a strange and sometimes uncouth kind of writing in broken and irregular lines, without meter, which yet called itself poetry, there arose as at the introduction of every new movement in the arts uneasiness and dismay. Two groups immediately formed: the great majority, who when not actively hostile were either indifferent or contemptuously amused, and a much smaller number, merely curious for the most part, but with open minds to see impartially to what the innovation might lead. It was perhaps in the nature of things that the mass of critics should have ranged themselves in the first class, since criticism, like law, is wedded to precedent; but even in those desirous of seeing the good, if good was to be seen, there existed confusion and bewilderment.

If the well-disposed were puzzled, however, there was soon explanation and to spare. Poets expounded the new theory or theories in preface after preface, spirited controversies sprang up between recent and rival schools, magazines came boldly forward as champions of the new order, and the air was thick with the dust of battle.

To those who like to take their poetry comfortably and at ease all this was exceedingly disturbing and—particularly when they discovered what the hubbub was about—very dull and uninteresting, since the talk dealt principally with modes, methods, means: in short, with technique. And yet we dare think that if these readers had been soundly acquainted with the history of literature they would have welcomed what was apparently mere sound and fury, for with all this warm talk, this shrewd discussion, this plentiful throwing about of wits, the poets were really at a very old game: they were dealing with that most alluring and forever elusive subject, their art. It was a healthy sign, and it had its previous analogies.

The last quickening thrill that ran through English poetry was, we suppose, that generated by the group known as the Neo-Celtic poets: Yeats, AE, Lionel Johnson, and others of scarce so wide a fame. And of them it may be here remarked that their influence was by no means confined to their own circle, but radiated out and shone forth, now feebly, now strongly, in the work of many an alien and distant writer. These, too, were the brief and brilliant days of *fin de siècle* in England—of Wilde, Symonds, Dowson, and their followers, and though their influence was neither so deep nor so wide, they made nevertheless a definite, if restricted, impression. Nor were these two movements absolutely aloof and without mutual

bearing, since there were some who, like Lionel Johnson, had affinities with, and derived inspiration from, both.

Going back, we find that the next historic agitation, the next general swarming about the hive of English poetry, was in the day of the Pre-Raphaelites. And what a body they were: in various degrees and for varying periods Patmore, Rossetti, Swinburne, Morris, O'Shaughnessy, and many more. And as in the two former instances innumerable other writers not nominally of the band warmed themselves at their fire.

To revert to the first thirty or forty years of the nineteenth century is to place ourselves in those sunny days when "England was a nest of singing-birds." Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Scott, Moore, Leigh Hunt—a list of immortals, who recast poetry and set the molds for nearly all subsequent English verse.

From these to the next great burst of song, the reign of Elizabeth, there stretches back a long and arid waste, a waste illuminated, it is true, by such names as Blake, Burns, Gray, Pope, Dryden and Milton, but illuminated for the most part fitfully and in isolated spots; and certainly in all that 200 years there was no particular time that could be properly distinguished as a "poetic period." We turn, then, to the age of Elizabeth, and to deal with that time is of course to have to do with the high gods of English poetry: Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Webster, Chapman, and the rest of the long line of dramatists and lyrists who have given an imperishable luster to their epoch.

Now it is a noteworthy fact that it is precisely at these periods and chiefly by these very men just named that poetry is talked about, quarreled over, discussed—eagerly, tirelessly, relentlessly, at enormous length; and not so much poetry in its subjects, its story, but poetry as an art—its style, its method. Their manifestoes and programs, their treatises and apologies, their "Germs," "Introductory Essays," "*Biographiae Litterariae*," "Defense of Poetry" or "of Poesy": all these are the commonplaces of critical knowledge; but to the curious we would point out as manifesting these characteristics almost in their extreme one group in particular, that, namely, of which Spenser was the foremost figure. Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Gabriel Harvey, their satellites and admirers, with their "Areopagus" when together and their epistles when apart—here was indeed a seething and turmoil. If ever men went into the minutiae of poetics, these did; and the story of their countless ventures and trials and experimentations is one of the most fascinating and valuable chapters open to the student of English letters.

We have, then, glanced rapidly over the most important

movements that have occurred in our poetry, movements differing widely in methods, in aims, and in subsequent influence, but all having this in common, that they were intensely, vitally, almost feverishly, concerned with the processes and the forms of poetry. That these periods of discussion were identical with the greatest periods of English song is undoubtedly something more than a coincidence. Whether the talk incited the poetry, or the poetry the talk, is of less interest; the truth probably is that they were mutually provocative and stimulating. The notable fact is that they did appear together; and this, too, is an additional fact of moment, that when talk died down, when discussion was at a low ebb, poetry also sank and became stagnant, and sometimes altogether disappeared.

If this holds true of our own literature, it holds also true for others, and if we should not seem to labor the point we might refer for confirmation to several diverse and widely separated periods: in France to that of Hugo and the almost innumerable "schools" of the last half of the nineteenth century; in Germany to the times just preceding and then synchronous with the careers of Schiller and Goethe; or finally to those numerous and flourishing academies of the old Italian cities, especially of Florence, which Milton so highly admired and of which he was indeed made a member. The Renaissance in general is, of course, fairly alive with similar manifestations of literary growth and activity; nor will the classical student be at a loss for exemplars in the great days of Athens and of Rome.

What, therefore, are we to think of this present noise and stir, this crying out of strange cries, this new challenge here and now in our midst? Chaucer, we think, gave a hint of the origin of this and all similar agitation when, over 500 years ago, he complained in that winning and melodious manner of his: "The life so short, the craft so long to learn." For poetry is a craft, and if much speech, unceasing exchange of ideas, wide airing of opinions will, as is most certain, conduce to the learning of that craft, then these things bear their own ample warrant and sanction.

Observe we say nothing here as to the intrinsic worth either of the present poetry or of the many words that flow so fluently and sometimes so brilliantly around it; but we do contend that this last, simply as a phenomenon, is a gracious sign in American letters and that by past reckoning it should be considered merely in itself as an augury and not an omen, an auspice and not a portent; for though movement is not life, it is life's first and most positive indication. And this, too, should be remembered, that the new poetry, in so far as it is poetry, will not be killed by criticism, nor insomuch as it is pretence will it be vitalized by propaganda.

JOHN BUNKER.

## REVIEWS

**Life of the Venerable Louise de Marillac** (Mademoiselle Le Gras), Foundress of the Company of Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. By ALICE LADY LOVAT. Preface by Father BERNARD VAUGHAN, S.J. New York: Longmans, Green & Co. \$3.50.

This thorough biography of St. Vincent de Paul's associate in founding the Sisters of Charity is necessarily an adequate account of his career as well, for Madame De Marillac's relations with St. Vincent somewhat resemble those of St. Jane Frances Du Chantal's with the holy Bishop of Geneva. Born in 1591, during the horrors of a civil war, and educated in the Dominican Monastery of St. Denis, at Poissy, Madame De Marillac took a vow at sixteen to be a Franciscan, but instead of becoming a religious then, she married somewhat later, Antoine Le Gras, her inferior in rank. Left a widow in 1625 with a little son, who afterwards caused her considerable anxiety,

Madame De Marillac placed herself under St. Vincent de Paul's spiritual guidance, and devoted herself to the "strong things": prayer, the service of the poor, and the cultivation of her talents for the glory of God.

In 1629, joining a "man's heart to a woman's thought," St. Vincent invoked the pious widow's aid in looking after the "charities" he had started to relieve the dreadful destitution that was then common among the poor of France. The work increased and spread. St. Vincent enlisted the services of devoted peasant girls, put Madame Louise at their head, and perhaps before either founder fully realized it, the Sisters of Charity came into existence, and the kind of congregation St. Francis of Sales had probably intended the Visitandines to be, was actually founded by St. Vincent de Paul and Madame Louise de Marillac. Hospital nursing, the care of those wounded in battle, the support of foundlings, 400 of whom were said to be abandoned every year in the streets of Paris, and the relief of the galley-slaves were some of the works of mercy that this noble woman, guided by St. Vincent, taught her Sisters to undertake successfully.

There are interesting pages in Lady Lovat's volume about the development of the Congregation's striking head-dress, and many examples are given of the Saint's shrewd counsels to Madame Louise. For instance, when she wished to have her name omitted from a list of those engaged in an undertaking she was prominently concerned in, St. Vincent warned her against the "vice of singularity," and when Madame Louise begged him never to pass over any fault he sees in her, the Saint answered: "Right willingly I will take care to acquaint you with all your defects and I will not pass over a single one." Madame De Marillac died March 15, 1660, only a few months before St. Vincent himself was called to his reward. Eight years after their founders' death the Sisters of Charity received the approbation of the Holy See, and Venerable Louise de Marillac's cause was introduced in 1895. W. D.

**The Declining Birth-Rate: Its Causes and Effects.** New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$3.50.

This closely-packed volume of 450 pages is made up of the report and the chief evidence taken by the National Birth-Rate Commission of England. It is not a book to be intrusted, as remarked by a reviewer, "*virginibus puerisque*." It makes sad and disheartening reading, for it calls attention on the one hand to a frightful evil, yet shows how wavering are the opinions of men supposed to be the guides and the teachers of their fellows on one of the very fundamental doctrines of morality and Christianity. The declining birth-rate is everywhere causing the most serious alarm. In Germany, France, in the United States, and in New England especially, the evils of which it is the index are widespread. England has felt alarmed at the danger, and the National Council of Public Morals instituted a commission to inquire into the evil. The commission was composed of such distinguished personages among others as the Anglican Bishop Boyd Carpenter (chairman), Sir John Gorst, the Duchess of Marlborough, Lieutenant-Colonel Fremantle, Dr. C. W. Saleeby, Rabbi Professor H. Gollancz. The Catholic Church was ably represented by the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Brown, who at one time in his capacity of witness gave the clearest and the soundest information to the commission and spoke with authority and uncompromising frankness on the position of the Catholic Church regarding the delicate matters which formed the subject of the investigation.

The commission itself recognizes the value of Monsignor Brown's testimony and calls it a "very lucid exposition of the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on this subject and of the reasons which determine it. His evidence should be carefully studied." The clear and outspoken stand taken by Monsignor Brown, because he had behind him the unerring teaching



of the Catholic Church, which absolutely condemns the sinful practices advocated by the champions of birth-control, stand out in striking contrast with that of the Anglican clergy, who are, to say the least, non-committal on the subject. The Report says: "In the absence of any authorized teaching, there are wide differences of opinion among the Anglican clergy on this subject. The objections formerly felt by almost all of them to family limitation have grown decidedly weaker since the beginning of the century. . . ." The Chief Rabbi, Dr. J. H. Hertz, the Report says, testified to the fact that among the Jews the use of preventives is strongly condemned as unclean and demoralizing. According to him, however, the only exceptions that could ever be allowed are where there is danger to life; for this consideration, according to him, overrides almost all moral rules. Against the whole theory and the sinful, selfish, unpatriotic, profoundly immoral practices of birth-restriction the Catholic Church has sternly and uncompromisingly set her face. They are of the devil, and she will not tolerate them. The nations of the world will one day call her blessed for the anathemas she has called down on the vile practice.

J. C. R.

**Great Inspirers.** By REV. J. A. ZAHM, C.S.C., Ph.D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. \$1.50.

Intrepid and idealizing, Dr. Zahm is continuing to "do his bit" in the chivalric field of fixing woman's place and of giving her her due. His thesis, in his new book, is that feminine inspiration has often been of no less moment than the masculine achievement, which that inspiration has evoked. History floods such a thesis with potential subject-matter, but it is a matter, which many regard uneasily, because they have been nauseated by the modern feminism. Dr. Zahm, returning to that wonderful fourth century, when the old world, after moving and breaking with the upspringing life of Christianity emerging from the Catacombs, was feeling the strong, colorful stir of new growth in religion and politics, sees in the group of women of patrician Rome, who were St. Jerome's unique class in Scripture, the influences definitely molding that Saint's vocation and his services to the Church. But it is preeminently in St. Paula and her daughter, St. Eustochium, that Dr. Zahm finds that which procured and so explains much of the heritage left us by St. Jerome. That these two women entered largely into the life and work of the great Doctor and Father is not to be controverted; their friendship and sympathy were enheartening, their inspiration provocative and quickening, their material, tangible help unburdening and empowering, but many readers would rather think of St. Jerome in majesty with his lion, than dependent, as "Great Inspirers" sketch him.

Coming to the overpowering figure of Dante Alighieri, Dr. Zahm leaves us convinced that Beatrice was Dante's Beatrice, and not the ontological Beatrice, however eruditely and impressively the argument is marshaled for a real Beatrice on pages which are the most acceptable of the whole book. Twice the reader is startled: once when, at length, he is introduced to Dante's wife, and again when assured that it is fortunate that Dante did not marry his inspirer. The text, bibliography and index of "Great Inspirers" declare the author a student and an enthusiast.

E. C.

**Ulysses S. Grant.** By LOUIS A. COOLIDGE. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$2.00.

The author of this entertaining book writes with full knowledge and in an easy, graceful style. We may not always agree with his conclusions, but the facts are fairly stated and the reader can draw his own inferences. The preface contains the names of a long list of writers on the same subject to whom the author acknowledges his indebtedness. Indeed, the length of the

list would lead one to believe that this new book was scarcely necessary. The volume forms a part, however, of the American Statesmen Series, which would not be complete without a biography of Grant. The long career of the great general is necessarily presented in a condensed form, but the author is not content with a mere narration of events and undertakes to prove a thesis. In the preface he says: "Grant's success in setting our feet firmly in the paths of peace and in establishing our credit with the nations of the world is scarcely less significant than his success in war." But the chapters devoted to Grant's presidential career do not support this view. After our Civil War both sides desired peace. It cannot properly be said that Grant's services in establishing peace were as significant as those which he rendered before the close of the conflict.

It is true that Grant suggested the arbitration of the Alabama Claims, but this remedy was an obvious one and the author admits that the success of the United States in this proceeding was due to the ability of Charles Francis Adams. In dealing with the Virginius affair and in advocating the payment of the national debt, Grant displayed that tenacity of purpose which marked him as a soldier. He did not, however, in these matters, attain the great distinction which he acquired in the field. It is Grant the soldier who will live in history. Roscoe Conkling, eager for votes in the Chicago Convention, began his great nominating speech with the well-known doggerel,

And when asked what State he hails from,  
Our sole reply shall be,  
He hails from Appotamox,  
And its famous apple-tree.

The allusion here is to the military, not the civil triumphs of Grant. The astute Conkling knew how to win votes for his candidate.

F. D. D.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

With the present number AMERICA begins the publication of a series of articles on teaching in the grade schools. The series will include all the branches usually found in the curriculum, and the authors are Sisters either actually engaged in teaching children, or connected with the normal schools of their respective Congregations. These articles will present an excellent idea of the quality of the work done in the parochial schools, and should be found exceedingly helpful both by teachers and students of pedagogy.

Catholics who are zealously striving to prevent the spread of radical Socialism, especially in country districts, will be interested in Mr. A. Leleu's excellent account of what "Study Centers for Work-Folk" are effecting in France, the paper which opens the March 22 number of the *Catholic Mind*. He writes:

Of all the dangers threatening the faith and virtue of the young not the least serious is surely that spirit of revolt and irreligion which is now to be found everywhere, the spirit which ridicules and challenges in newspaper, in public meetings, in workshop, what were once regarded as first principles. Utterly childish is the notion that our young people will not be brought face to face with these disturbing questions. They will put these problems to themselves, and if we do not supply them with the true answers the newspaper, the public house, the workshop will soon supply false ones. Speaking to five or six of the most sensible boys in my club, I put to them some of those questions with which Socialists maintain that they puzzle Catholics. Not one of them could give a decent answer. "But," I said, "do your Socialist companions never ask you such questions?" "Indeed, sir, they do." "And what do you say?" "Nothing, sir." "Then they call you fools?" "Yes, sir; they say Catholics are stupid and ignorant." That was bad enough, but worse was to follow. I took up one of the Socialist difficulties and began to show how to answer it. Lo! my little friends were no longer tongue-tied; they had fifty

answers to my argument! Poor boys! they did not know a single Catholic reply, but had the Socialist arguments pat!

As similar conditions are to be found, no doubt, in this country, the author's practical directions for applying an effective remedy should be widely read. In the next article Mr. Harry Wilson, former editor of the Los Angeles *American Catholic*, a High-Church periodical, tells "Why I Became a Catholic." The number concludes with a paper on "The Unceasing Sacrifice," showing how Mass is being offered in some part of the world every hour of the day.

The March number of the *Catholic Convert* opens with Anna McClure Scholl's notable paper, entitled "From Skepticism to Faith." She tells how the remark of a Theosophist friend, "The Church of Rome is the only one that has preserved the mysteries," set her thinking, and finally made her see that the Catholic Church "Not only accepted the Incarnation and all that flowed from it, but she was mistress of a realm for an explanation of whose laws Protestantism since the era of the Higher Criticism was forced to appeal to the Society of Psychical Research." Dr. Locke and Mrs. Pember also tell the story of their conversion; Dom Leonard Sargent, O.S.B., announces that a group of Americans in Downside Abbey, England, are preparing to establish a Benedictine priory in this country; the formation of new convert leagues at Buffalo and at Roselle, N. J., is noted, and the recent reception of five ministers into the Church is chronicled.

"When the advertiser saw the cathedral spires over the downs in the distance, he looked at them and wept. 'If only,' he said, 'this were an advertisement of Beefo, so nice, so nutritious, try it in your soup, ladies like it.'" That is one of the "Fifty-one Tales" (Little, Brown, \$1.25) by Lord Dunsany, the Irish dramatist, who is now enjoying such a vogue in this country. And here is a bit of his poetical prose:

O little pale-green image whose wanderings are from far, know thou that here in Europe and in other lands nearby, too soon there pass from us the sweets and song and the lion strength of youth: too soon do their cheeks fade, their hair grow gray and our beloved die; too brittle is beauty, too far off is fame and the years are gathered too soon; there are leaves, leaves falling, everywhere falling; there is autumn among men, autumn and reaping; failure there is, struggle, dying and weeping, and all that is beautiful hath not remained, but is even as the glory of morning upon the water.

"The True History of the Hare and Tortoise" is a clever satire, and "The assignation," a rather bitter one. A number of the author's stories seem to need, like Tagore's, explanatory footnotes.

In "The Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century" (Benziger, \$1.75) Father Francis Breymann, S.J., has made accessible to a wider reading public a popular German work by Rev. Constantine Kempf, S.J., which was favorably commented upon in AMERICA at the time of its first appearance. It contains in brief outline the lives of many saintly men and women whose virtues were the glory of the Church in the century just passed, and who have shown forth to their own generation that holiness in her members which is a mark of the true Faith. The names themselves have been taken from the official catalogues of the Congregation of Rites published in 1901 and 1907, setting forth all the processes of beatification and canonization in progress during those years, while account has likewise been taken of other publications which have given due notice of new processes introduced from time to time. Thus is offered a long list of bishops, priests, religious men and women, members of the

laity, and finally a resplendent line of martyrs. The latter, evidently, could not all be mentioned singly, for they are numbered by the thousands. The book is an interesting and convincing demonstration that the Church of God was the same in the nineteenth century as in the first century of her establishment by Christ. By her fruits men may still know her. It is the test Christ Himself has given. A copious bibliography lends additional value to the work.

Mr. J. G. Snead-Cox, Canon William Barry, Viola Meynell, Helen Eden, and Sir Bertram Windle are contributors to the January *Dublin Review*. Miss Meynell's appraisal of Julian Grenville, the English soldier who was killed during the Ypres campaign, brings out well his varied gifts. Mrs. Eden has another beautiful poem, entitled "Coal and Candlelight," about one of her children:

Who, newly slumbering on my lap,  
Stirs in resentful quietude.  
Her little shawl-swathed fists enfold  
One cherished forefinger of mine;  
Her callow hair with Tuscan gold  
Is penciled in the candleshine;  
Her cheeks' sweet heraldry, exprest  
Each evening since her happy birth,  
Is argent to her mother's breast  
And gules to the emblazoning hearth.  
Only the lashes of her eyes  
Some ancient discontent impairs,—  
Which, for their abdicated skies,  
Are pointed with forgotten tears.  
And so, as simply as a bird,  
She nestles.—There is no child else  
To rouse her with a reckless word  
Or clink her rattle's fallen bells:  
All, long dismissed with wonted prayers,  
Such apostolic vigils keep.  
Mary, who through the centuries holds  
Her crown'd Son in her hand, amid  
Her mantle's black Byzantine folds,  
More tenderly displayed than hid,  
O'er this tramontane hearth presides  
Oracular of Heaven and Rome—  
Where Peter is, the Church abides,  
Where Mary and her Son, the home.  
All day she blesses my employ  
Where surge and eddy round my knee.  
Swayed by a comfit or a toy,  
The battles of eternity.

The book-reviews, which are, as usual, remarkably good, are no longer signed with initials, nor is any author's name appended to an interesting paper on "The Notebooks of Francis Thompson," which ends with this charming rendering of an early English lullaby:

Lullay, lullay, little child, why weepest thou so sorely?  
Need is thine of weeping: it was foredoomed thee early  
Ever to live in sorrow, in sighing and in mourning  
As thine eldren did ere this, that are unreturning.  
Lullay, little child; child, lullay, lullow:  
To an uncouth worldly-comen art thou now.

Beast and every bird too; the fish that in the flood is;  
And each creature living, that made of bone and blood is;  
When it cometh to the world, its coming for its good is;  
All, but the wretched thing that of Adam's blood is.  
Lullay, lullay, little child; to care thy mother bore thee:  
Thou know'st not this world is wild, which she has set before thee.

Child, if betideth that thou shalt thrive and be,  
Think thou wert y-fostered on thy mother's knee.  
Ever have mind in thy heart of these things three—  
Whence thou comest, where thou art, and what shall come of thee.  
Lullay, lullay, little child; child, lullay, lullay:  
With sorrow thou camest to this world, with sorrow shalt wend away.



## EDUCATION

## History in the Grade School

THE study of history introduces the young mind to the record of the past, putting the child in touch with the race and with traditional ideals that he finds it a duty to cherish and pass on. It enriches his humanity, and has far-reaching results in the molding of his life and character. "He who is ignorant of what happened before his own day," says Cicero, "is always a child." A knowledge of history compensates largely for the pupil's lack of experience. Even in its elementary character, it helps often to the fuller understanding of subject-matters in correlated branches, throwing light on their origin, growth or development, thus modifying the child's views, and clearing up for him many points that might otherwise remain obscure. It quickens his imagination, coming home to him in due time, "not as a series of facts with no relation to the life around him, but as a living document, pulsating, throbbing with life out of which his own future experiences may grow."

## CULTURAL AND PRACTICAL

THUS, as a record of man's achievements history is interesting, stimulating, making as it does powerful appeals to intellectual curiosity and furnishing wise answers to the oft-repeated "whys" and "hows" of childhood. For always, no matter how young the disciple, "history is philosophy teaching by example." To class this branch of study as cultural rather than practical is to overlook the fact that "from the distant days of Thucydides, students of history have been men of ability, and that in our own time they shape the policy and for twenty years have controlled the destinies of the United States."

In its humanistic character, history is quite as important a factor in elementary education as language and literature. It calls into play the child's emotional activities; casts new light on his environment and on his relations to others; broadens his sympathies; stimulates his volitional powers, while continually impressing upon him a lesson of supreme importance—his personal responsibility in daily life and conduct.

## ITS MORAL VALUE

BUT history has its supreme importance in its moral value. As a directing influence in life, and as a mold of character it is a powerful auxiliary to religion. It stimulates love of virtue and hatred of vice, thus incidentally preparing the child for good citizenship. It holds up for his imitation heroic examples of moral courage, self-sacrifice, patriotism, sanctity. Thus the wise educator looks upon the cult of great men as a vital principle in education, and urges that as soon as possible the child should be made acquainted with the deeds of

"The dead but sceptered sovereigns who still rule  
Our spirits from their urns."

Moreover, the study of history strengthens the child's belief in Divine Providence which shapes the destinies of nations as well as of individuals. In this connection the Bible story is of special assistance. In its majestic simplicity, it not only awakens the child's intellectual and esthetic faculties, but it unfolds, as it were, what has been reverently termed his "God-consciousness," revealing to him easily and conclusively the narrative of the Creator's relations with the world, thus serving "to justify the ways of God to men." Early impressions of this character remain with him as a strong resisting power.

History is a window opening on the pageant of time, and it should be remembered that the child can grasp the meaning of the picture only by degrees. The concrete rather than the abstract, persons rather than things, attract the interest of the child. His lessons in history, therefore, for the

first and second years should be the life-story of the world's great leaders as identified with important events, and as the centers of important movements. At this stage, locality and sequence of time may be more or less disregarded. Much of the work should be oral, although it is important that the child be introduced progressively to books. The advantages of oral teaching are interest and vivacity. If the teacher present the story clearly and vividly, the child will in imagination become himself the hero or heroine of the tale, living over again experiences that may fix deep in his heart some fine moral lesson, or register indelibly in his mind some great historical truth. He will delight in repeating the story in language enriched by the teacher's vocabulary. Each effort will bring to him additional knowledge, a strengthening of memory and a vital gain in oral expression.

## WITH THE BEGINNERS

IN the third grade, to the biographical studies, myths, legends, historical tales of Indian life and relics, should be added some account of the heroes of all times and a more or less systematic reading of history. Essential facts should be emphasized and the child taught to discriminate between legendary and historic, word and idea, matter and form, in the subject presented. Thus the effort should be towards the development of an historical sense. Even in the third grade the child should be made familiar with the lives, struggles and triumphs of the early missionaries. The Catholic teacher has abundant material from which to make her selection. The Catholic child has the right to know that in America the Church is no alien, that its story forms one of the most brilliant, most heroic and most touching chapters in the history of the New World. In every succeeding grade the attention of the child should be called to facts that will bring this lesson home.

## THE HIGHER GRADES

IN connection with the reading periods that may be used once or twice a week, an intelligent oral reproduction should be exacted, so that each topic shall be carefully mastered before the next is taken up. Wall maps (neither too small nor too complicated), pictures (not too many) will help to visualize the grade matter, for the pupil, giving him vivid impressions of facts and situations.

In the fourth and fifth grades the study of American history may be made to center around the following topics: explorers, life in the various colonies, local pioneers, New France, narratives of great statesmen and heroes, the Revolution, the new republic, the Civil War, great industries. Constant correlation with geography through globes, maps of the country, and route-maps must be insisted on, together with much correlation of literature and picture study.

The succeeding grades of American history call for plans and treatment more detailed and complex; we may here only touch upon some of the underlying principles. Although history-teaching in the elementary schools is focused round the history of our country, America cannot be understood without taking into account the previous history of its colonists. This need not, and should not, mean at this stage European history, but simply some knowledge of characteristics and incidents that will enable the pupil to understand the peoples who came here in the wake of Columbus, Cabot and Cartier. The Atlantic and the Pacific are natural, not historical, boundaries. Important also are those features of ancient and medieval life which explain the elements of our civilization, or show how the movement for discovery and colonization originated. Definite impressions are to be aimed at rather than scientific study, for which the pupil is still unprepared. Emphasis is to be placed on important dates, on geographical facts, on the movements

that caused emigration to America, and on the character of the civilization in the cradle lands of the emigrants themselves.

#### THE OLD-WORLD BACKGROUND

**I**N time the settlement and the growth of the colonies are to be taken up, with enough of the European background to explain how events in America had their causes in the Old World. In this light also the American Revolution should be considered, then the inauguration of the new government, the political, industrial and social development of the United States, westward expansion, and the growth of the great rival States of Europe.

To maintain continued interest through the elementary course there should be offered to the pupil in each of the different years *one distinct* portion or section of our country's history, and this should be presented *fully and finally* as far as the teaching in the elementary schools goes.

A final suggestion would be that any arrangement of subject matter determined upon should be scholarly, that it should have definite grouping and offer a feasible scheme for both average teacher and pupil. In general this would insure a simple handling and an effective presentation of the topics in question. To be learned intelligently, history must be properly taught.

A SISTER OF CHARITY.

College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York City.

#### SOCIOLOGY

##### The "Birth-Controllers"

**S**OME weeks ago, Dr. Frank Crane, a daily contributor to forty syndicated newspapers, undertook to discuss the subject of "Birth-Control." Now this is rather a touchy matter, particularly in view of the recent report of the English National Birth-rate Commission, together with the action of the New York County Medical Society, the rejection of the whole sordid mess by the New York Legislature, and the plain-spoken decision on the commercial aspects of this immaculate crusade rendered by Mr. Justice Crompton of the Supreme Court. Nothing daunted, however, Dr. Crane boldly asserts that "the best part of the medical profession seems to be enlisted among the champions of birth-control." "Asserts" is a carefully chosen word; for of proof Dr. Crane offers not a vestige.

Glancing down the paragraphs, one discerns the names of Drs. S. A. Knopf and A. Jacobi, a quotation from the *Medical Times*, and a reference to a moving-picture. Yet none of these surpassing authorities backs Dr. Crane's assertion. Dr. Knopf merely cites the hackneyed examples of Holland, New Zealand and Australia, countries in which, as is well-known, social, economic, moral and political conditions exactly parallel our own. The *Medical Times*, Dr. Crane's second authority, remarks, with an exhibition of logic for which a schoolboy would deserve a sound spanking, that the military efficiency of France is due chiefly to contraceptives. Dr. Jacobi suggests that our present laws "are grievously wrong and unjust," and the "movie," which after a brief career has flickered away into darkness, is said to show "possibilities of horror and cruelty." With the extinct film ends Dr. Crane's proof of his thesis that "the best part of the medical profession seems to be enlisted among the champions of birth-control."

##### THE STUBBORN FACTS

**Y**ET, if facts mean anything, the best part of the medical profession is at direct variance with Dr. Crane. Dr. Howard Kelly, of Johns Hopkins, is a respectable authority, equal in knowledge and professional reputation to Drs. Jacobi and Knopf, and not unworthy of mention, perhaps, even in

connection with Margaret Sanger and the soap-box brawlers of Union Square. This, however, is a bold assertion, and I do not press it. Dr. Kelly states his opinion that "all meddling with the sexual relation to secure facultative sterility degrades the wife to the level of the prostitute," and notes the spiritual degradation consequent upon such unnatural practices. Dr. J. F. Rooney, representing the New York State Medical Society, declared before the legislative committee at Albany on March 6, "that the proposed amendment [legalizing the contraceptive propaganda] would be a crime against the commonwealth. The medical profession is opposed to this legislation." (New York *Tribune*, March 7.) On December 26, 1916, the New York County Medical Society, by a vote of 210 to 72, adopted a report prepared by a committee after months of careful study. This report maintains that "any such action [recommending a change in the New York law] on part of the organized medical profession would be most inappropriate at any time, and particularly at the present moment." Furthermore, it condemned "certain foreign procedures . . . copied and promulgated in this country," as "absurd, filthy and frequently dangerous." So much for the local medical fraternity. Should Dr. Crane care for the opinion of eminent English medical, legal, social, and religious authorities on this filthy and unnatural crime, he can find it in "The Declining Birth-rate," prepared by the National Birth-rate Commission, and lately published by Dutton.

#### MORALITY AND IGNORANCE

**"A**S to the moral side of the question," continues Dr. Crane, "it is about time to abandon the theory that virtue depends on ignorance." As no one, with the possible exception of some prehistoric Dr. Crane, ever held such a theory, the absurdity may be passed over in a silence born of pity. ". . . and that knowledge is dangerous to one's soul. That is a doctrine which belongs to the Middle Ages. All knowledge is clean. It is ignorance that is poison." Knowledge, that is, the intellectual apprehension of truth, is not of itself "dangerous." But knowledge of a particular fact may be and often is exceedingly "dangerous" to a particular "soul," and any knowledge may be misused. On this fact every community and every individual of sound mind daily acts. To know how to put beans up one's nose is "knowledge," but no wise mother teaches it in the nursery. The deliberate purpose of many publishers is to prevent certain forms of undoubted "knowledge" from reaching those who will be hurt by it. They will sell only to "specialists." Is the resultant ignorance "poisonous"? Only a few days since, Secretary Daniels requested the newspapers to exercise, in case of war, "a wise censorship," i.e., withhold certain "knowledge," and President Wilson and Secretary Lansing, in communicating certain facts to the country, kept back much "knowledge" in their possession, on the ground that disclosure would not be for the public good. Is the Secretary of State spreading the poison of ignorance by deliberately refusing, as he very properly does, to throw open the complete archives of the State Department to every comer, or even to serious students of history and politics? Has anyone a right to the "knowledge" of how to apply or pervert the forces of nature, known by natural science, for the propagation of crime, social disorder and disease? Am I injected with the poison of ignorance if one of Mr. Osborne's reformed safe-blowers refuses to initiate me into the mysteries of special drills and "soup"? Obviously, there is a knowledge that is unto edification, and a knowledge that is destruction.

A "Birth-Control League," to which a New York subsidized magazine of near-thought has opened its pages, approaches the question from another angle. Describing themselves as "distinguished men and women," e.g., Mabel Kittredge, Mr. and



Mrs. Paul Manship, Warner Fite, William Montagu, and other unknown Hampdens, they announce that "the question as to whether or not, and when, a woman should have a child . . . is a question for the individual family to decide." Premising that the agents are lawfully married, a caution not to be overlooked when dealing with "uplifters," no objection can be urged against this statement, except its banality. But the "not" and the "when" must not be determined by a violation of nature. To "violate nature" in the present instance is to pervert the natural action of human faculties; to "improve on nature" is to aid these faculties, by approved means, to attain their end more securely. The second is lawful; the first, always forbidden. Needless to say, this League argues for the legalization of the first method.

#### THE CATHOLIC VIEW

THE ground of the Catholic condemnation of contraceptive practices is easily stated. But it has no appeal to any man who has determined to rule God out of his world, and very little to those who make self-gratification, or utility, private or communal, the norm of right and wrong. According to the Catholic view, the proximate criterion of right and wrong is human nature itself adequately considered, that is, with its appetites and its faculties and all its parts and relations. Whatever is in harmony with this nature is good; whatever impedes it is evil. "In the natural order, man's body," writes St. Thomas (*"Contra Gentiles,"* 1. 3, c. 129), "is for his soul, and the lower powers of the soul because of reason. They ought, it follows, to afford help, as instruments, not to impede. It is therefore naturally right for man so to manage his body and the lower faculties of his soul, so that the act and good of reason may be least of all hindered, but rather helped. Mismanagement in this regard must naturally be sinful. We count therefore as things naturally evil, carousings and revelings and the disorderly indulgence of the sexual instinct." To make use of a faculty in such a manner as to prevent it from attaining its end is obviously so to use it "that the act and good of reason" is perverted. It is, therefore, naturally wrong.

Take, for instance, lying. "The natural end of the faculty of speech is the expression of one's inner convictions. But if speech be used to express what we believe to be false, the faculty is used unnaturally, and the act is morally bad." (Cronin, *"Science of Ethics,"* Vol. I, p. 129). Similarly, the specific end or purpose of the generative faculty is procreation; for the faculty, by its nature, tends primarily to this end. Otherwise, it would not be "generative." But the use of a contraceptive prevents the faculty from attaining its natural end. It is, therefore, naturally wrong i.e., forbidden by the law of nature. As Dr. Ryan has well remarked, "It is on exactly the same moral level and is wrong for precisely the same reason as the practice of solitary vice," as well as of certain horrible disorders generally summed up in legal treatises under the head of crimes against nature.

#### THE COMMERCIAL ASPECT

A FEW remarks, taken from unimpeachable sources, throw a flood of light on the motives which have energized the New York propaganda for the legalization of unnatural sin. Dr. James F. Mooney, of the State Medical Society, testifying before the legislative commission, expressed his conviction that "this movement is largely a financial proposition on the part of persons who are making money out of it by selling articles at a profit of from eight hundred to one thousand per cent. And they are taking that from the poor." With shocking brutality, Mr. Justice Cropsey in his decision in *"The People &c. v. Byrne,"* writes:

The defendant stands convicted. . . . The evidence introduced showed that the defendant had sold . . . which was designed to prevent conception. This was the basis of the information and the resulting conviction.

This Byrne woman, be it remarked in passing, is the convicted individual who has since been banqueted as "a martyr to principle." Mr. Cropsey continues:

The article was not worth more than fifty cents, but was sold by the defendant for two dollars. In conjunction with the sale the defendant disseminated literature dealing with the question of conception, and setting forth various ways and means by which it could be prevented. One of these pamphlets is labeled "What Every Girl Should Know." This contains matters which not only should not be known by every girl, but which perhaps should not be known by any. *The distribution of these pamphlets, especially to girls just coming into womanhood, would be a shocking disgrace to the community.*

In the following paragraph Mr. Cropsey passes a judgment which seems to apply to the general run of the unclean tribe:

The defendant claims that her undertaking in furnishing this information and these appliances is prompted by a sole desire to serve her sex. However that may be, *the evidence shows that there was decidedly a commercial aspect to the undertaking, for not only was each article sold at a great profit, but in addition a regular fee was charged to each visitor, and the visitors numbered one hundred or more each day.*

To Catholics the liceity of these practices is not even debatable. The Church's legislation clarifies and reinforces the law of nature, and is as unchangeable as that law. There is no room for argument. Whenever the primary purpose of procreation is excluded by deliberate perversion of the generative faculty there is sin against nature, and whoever persists in this course cannot be admitted to the Sacraments. That is final.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

#### NOTE AND COMMENT

##### Mexican Refugees

THE sufferings of Mexican refugees in our own country have often been brought to the notice of American Catholics. The most recent instance is reported from the mining town of Hartshorne, Oklahoma, where two small rooms of a wash-house constitute at present the entire monastery of a community of Carmelite Fathers who came as refugees from Mexico. Together with some Sisters of Charity, likewise exiled from their native land, they took up the hardest and most thankless work among the poor foreign mining population, and sought to do for the children what they could not accomplish for the parents. "The fruits of their labors were often destroyed by the drunkenness and immorality of the children's miserable homes." Providence permitted that, in addition to their other trials, the church in which they ministered on their arrival and its rectory were consumed by fire, leaving them houseless as well as expatriated, but recommending them doubly thereby to the charity of American Catholics. The souls of the 300 children in their spiritual care will surely not be lost for want of helping hands.

##### The Eloquence of Deeds

THE first lesson the modern world must relearn is the lesson of obedience. Parents fail to teach it and children do not understand it. Free development, that is, license, is the principle of modern education. Hence the supreme importance of the silent but eloquent lesson taught us by St. Joseph. Obedience, as Father Joseph Conroy, S.J., says in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, was the family trait of that home whereof the Incarnate Word

Himself was the most obedient member. Obedience was the master key in the hand of Joseph:

See the swift, uncompromising, accurate, persevering obedience of St. Joseph! Four successive, astonishing, abrupt commands, rising in cumulative difficulty one above the other, given at a peculiarly embarrassing moment, with a note, we may almost say, of harshness running through them; with not the least preliminary to relieve any shock of surprise, with no hint of practical direction, no softening phrase of exhortation or encouragement to mitigate their bluntness. And without a word the work assigned is entered upon at once, and, exactly according to instructions, unflinchingly followed through. It meant exile, danger, perhaps death. But yet from Joseph only silent obedience.

In this obedience, "following shadow-like and imaging God's will," trusting in all things to the Father-love of God, consisted the eloquence of the Saint from whose lips we have not one recorded word in Holy Scripture. That eloquence, more golden than any speech, he will teach us in the silence of our souls. In the school of St. Joseph the world can swiftly pass through all its graded lessons, from the fear of God to the fullness of wisdom.

#### The New York Apostolate

IN rounding out the twentieth year of its activities the New York Apostolate has presented to his Eminence, Cardinal Farley, the following summary of its services: number of missions to Catholics, 506; number of missions to non-Catholics, 236; number of converts, 4,442; number of adult Catholics prepared for First Communion and Confirmation, 12,000; number of confessions heard, 727,657. In an article written for the *Catholic World*, Joseph E. Wickham describes the blessings that these missions have brought:

Only the silent Lord knows of the peace, such as the world could not give, that He gave to His souls in the mission tribunals. It has been a varied procession that has passed through the doors of the churches on those early mornings and late evenings of twenty years. The rich and the lowly, the gentle and simple, the scholar and the unlearned, the sinner and the saint, all of them are in that mighty host that came to the Master's teaching. Leaving all things they followed Him trustfully, and He led them to the hills of eternal peace.

One of the most powerful means for combating the materialism of our age is the fervent mission with its renewal of Catholic life throughout an entire parish. Excellent work has been accomplished by the New York Apostolate, yet doubtless the zealous priests of the mission band will look upon it all as only an earnest of still greater things to be achieved in the decades to come.

#### Catholic Monthly War Letters

A VOLUMINOUS Catholic literature is appearing in connection with the war. French, German, Belgian and English propaganda matter is sent to Catholic readers, and in particular to the Catholic clergy. There is doubtless danger in all this unless sane and Christian rules are strictly adhered to. Joseph Matt, in the *Catholic Monthly Letter*, believes that if certain mistakes are conscientiously avoided, such as impugning the motives of adversaries or denying the honesty of their convictions, the national letters may be made

mediums of a truly Catholic exchange of views and pathfinders of reconciliation in the literary and religious spheres. Let the French and the British and the German propaganda literature carry to Catholics in neutral countries the tidings of past struggles and achievements, of present ideals and endeavors, and of beneficent results of the visitation of God through this war of nations. Let them be instruments to perfect the grand works of charity undertaken in all coun-

tries, and to pave the way for the coming day of reconstruction.

These are noble words and correctly outline the work that Catholic writers can accomplish in the various countries now at war. If all will conscientiously acknowledge the profound Catholic loyalty of their adversaries, and strive to serve the Church by making known throughout the world the power of her Sacraments, the sweetness of her charity, the consolation of her Divine doctrines in the hour of supreme human need, and at the same time the spirit of duty and patriotism which is everywhere instilled by her into the souls of her children, they will not have labored in vain. If such rules are overlooked the work had better have been left undone.

#### "Shall Education Be Rockefellerized?"

SOME years ago the passage of a law for a Federal charter was sought by the "Rockefeller Foundation," says the *American Federationist*, and was emphatically rejected. Nothing daunted, the Standard Oil Company continued its efforts and succeeded in securing a charter from the State of New York. Its gigantic plan was now inaugurated:

The breadth and subtlety of that plan have been understood by only a few. The Foundation has an endowment of nearly a billion dollars; that means dynamic power. Affiliations and working relations have been established with educational agencies, with influence and standing. Many of these agencies have been withheld from general information, for it is recognized that anything known to emanate from the Rockefellers is discounted and mistrusted.

A working agreement was therefore contrived with various Government departments. Men in the service of the Standard Oil agencies were placed on the Government pay-roll with a nominal salary, while they drew a real salary from some "private" Rockefeller institution. Thus the Government prestige was given to their propaganda, representing purely private interests. "An investigation, directed by the United States Senate, revealed that 152 persons were on the pay-roll of the Federal Bureau of Education, at a salary of one dollar per annum, while they received from other institutions or associations salaries ranging from \$10,000 down." The viciousness of such a proceeding consisted in the fact that documents written by these Standard Oil agents were published as Government documents and distributed in large numbers. The *Federationist* says:

Is there any reason why the nation's business should be delegated to private enterprise? To be sure the Rockefeller Foundation has an enormous sum of money available for this purpose, probably as much as the Government would feel justified in devoting to the same purpose. But that very fact leads immediately to asking how did two men acquire control over so much power. The history of the Standard Oil Company is well known. No methods could be more ruthless or discreditable. Because of the methods by which Rockefeller wealth was accumulated the people instinctively distrust it for whatever purpose it is used. . . . If freedom is to be maintained in this and other lands private enterprise must not be permitted to control sources of information. Information is of value only when salient facts associated with its development are known. Research inspired by Standard Oil funds should bear the Standard Oil trade-mark; research that bears the imprint of Government sanction should be made by bona fide Government agencies.

Whatever motive may be ascribed to the Rockefeller institutions, they must under no conditions be permitted to dominate the sources of information or the avenues of education. They must not be allowed to parade under the semblance of State or Government authority. In this contention the *American Federationist* is right.